Maria Valtorta

The Vatican File

This book is dedicated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and St. Michael the Archangel

It is not enough to do good, one must do good well (as Christ did)
Saint Vincent de Paul (1581–1660)

Abbreviations

T9ch19 T9ch600 = Volume 9, chapter 19 of the first translation (1979) Volume 9, chapter 600 of the second translation (2017).

MV: Maria Valtorta, EMV: The Gospel as Revealed to Me […] Words in square brackets have been added by the author-editor (…) indicates a section that has been removed to comply with the legal requirements for short quotations permitted by law and to focus on the essential by removing anything that is not directly relevant.

1st edition (French) May 30, 2025, 308 p.
2nd edition (French) July 18, 2025, 454 p.

Copyleft Alexis Maillard, author-publisher of:
The New Crampon Bible (2022)
The New Crampon Bible in Large Print Size 18 (2023)
The Bible of Rome (8 volumes, 3,900 pages, including 2,000 pages of verse-by-verse commentary on the four Gospels, 2023)
At http://jesusmarie.com/verset.html you can find the Port Royal, Dom Calmet, Fillion, Crampon-1904, Allioli, and Lethielleux editions of the Bible.
Each verse of the Bible is explained.
Alexis Maillard created and runs the website JesusMarie.com FRANCE
valtortacondamnee@yahoo.comsitejesusmarie@gmail.com If the email address is broken, please contact us via the email address on JesusMarie.com and its official social media accounts.

ISBN EAN

Book outline

Preface
Nine Notes on True Private Revelations
Rules for discerning true revelations from false ones

PART ONE

Brief Note by Bishop Giovanni Pepe
Summary by A. Maillard
Condemnation by 14 theologians of the Holy Office: Morano, Luigi Traglia, Aloïs Hudal, Mariano Cordovani, Oorr, Augustin Hürth, Liburdi, Creusen, Parente, Sebastian Tromp, Grendel, Bigazzi, Dalpiaz; February 14, 1949
Condemnation by the cardinals of the Holy Office, February 16, 1949 Condemnation by Pope Pius XII on February 17, 1949
Opinion of Father Alberto
Vaccari Summary by A. Maillard
Opinion of Father Agostino Béa, confessor to Pius XII
Summary by A. Maillard

SECOND PART

213 Theological Errors
153 Indecent acts
43 Scientific Errors
20 Vulgarities
7 Oddities
7 Remarks
7 instances of anti-Semitism

Conclusion
Table of Contents

Preface

4 million copies sold, translated into 30 languages

The foundation that holds the literary rights to Maria Valtorta's writings is located in Isola del Liri, in the province of Frosinone, Italy, in the diocese of Sora-Cassino-Aquino-Pontecorvo, whose bishop is Gerardo Antonazzo.

Viareggio, where Maria Valtorta lived, is located in the province of Lucca in Tuscany, Italy, and belongs to the diocese of Pisa (Arcidiocesi di Pisa), whose archbishop, since February 2025, is Monsignor Saverio Cannistrà, OCD.

Pleasing God - Offering constructive criticism

These pages are written to honor the Blessed Virgin Mary and to repair the deeply disrespectful things written by Maria Valtorta. It is an opportunity, by offering constructive criticism of her writings, to try to progress in a better understanding of the Catholic faith and the Holy Gospels.

Several of my friends love the writings of Maria Valtorta; they are good people, sometimes very intelligent. This book is not written against them or to hurt them. I myself was once an admirer of this 10-volume gospel. I ask them to recognize that as Catholics, we have the right to criticize particular revelations and not to believe in them. I ask them to give me the benefit of the doubt.

There is nothing derogatory about saying "Valtorta" or talking about "Valtortist."

One can refer to Mozart or Kant without mentioning their first names. There is no lack of respect or courtesy in doing so. Similarly, we use the word "Valtortists" to refer to people, more or less vehemently, who defend Valtorta and her writings. Our intention is not to disrespect them. There is no desire to denigrate them in our approach. We shared the same opinions as them a few years ago.

The providential help of three members of the clergy and the indecencies written against Jesus and Mary (particularly in the Good Friday visions) led me to write this book.

Providentially and very easily, important documents from the official file of the Holy Office on Maria Valtorta came into my possession thanks to three members of the clergy (in 2025, the Holy Office is called the "Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith"). Maria Valtorta's file is in its Archives, numbered 355/45. It is about five inches thick). It therefore seemed to us that God wanted us to publish them to inform people of good will who, like us in the past, were victims of Father Berti's lie about

the false statement that Pius XII allegedly made during the audience that the Servants of Mary obtained on February 26, 1948.

These documents help us understand why the Catholic Church refuses to believe that the visions and dictations come from Heaven or are inspired by the Holy Spirit. (*The Gospel as Revealed to Me* is currently being printed in 10 volumes of 500 pages each). Valtorta's work consists of 8,468 printed pages.

The *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* declared again in 2025 that these writings are not of supernatural origin

"Regarding the writings of Maria Valtorta

The Holy See often receives requests for clarification from clergy and laity regarding the Church's position on the writings of Maria Valtorta, such as the work *The Poem of the Man-God*, now known as *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*, and other publications.

In this regard, it is reiterated that the alleged "visions ," "revelations," and "communications" contained in the writings of Maria Valtorta, or at least attributed to her, cannot be considered supernatural in origin, but must be regarded as mere literary forms used by the author to recount, in her own way, the life of Jesus Christ.

In its long tradition, the Church does not accept the apocryphal Gospels and other similar texts as normative, since it does not recognize their divine inspiration, referring to the sure reading of the inspired Gospels.

Vatican City, February 22, 2025

Since 1949, condemnations of Valtorta's work have multiplied, but her supporters, the *Valtortists*, remain fervent due to widespread lies

aimed at making people believe that Pius XII and several saints had approved it. The Valtortists seem unable to see the differences between the verses of the Gospels and the version changed by Maria Valtorta. They ask the Church to explain better why *The Gospel as Revealed to Me* has always been condemned.

A letter in 2024 from Pope Francis confirms the purely human, literary origin of *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*.

Following the statement issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in February 2025, the Valtortists published a letter dated February 24, 2024, in which Pope Francis encourages Don Ernesto Zucchini, parish priest, founder, and president of the Maria Valtorta Foundation in Viareggio (Italy) with this very significant sentence, bearing in mind that it is a Jesuit pope who writes these lines: "I encourage you to continue with the same commitment your mission of making known the life and Maria Valtorta and her **literary** work**,** especially all that it can offer for the good of the Church and society. Forward!" We have emphasized the word "literary" because the pope is careful not to write "her mystical work" or
" her spiritual work," knowing full well that the Magisterium of the Church has continually declared that this work cannot be supernatural because of the serious doctrinal, historical, topographical, geographical, etc. errors it contains. Faithful to his approach of encouraging the good that can be found in an overall bad situation, the pope encourages the desire to do good with a literary work that has been condemned.

It is significant that this letter was kept secret by the Valtortists until the publication of the statement of condemnation by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

We speak of "condemnation" because the Dicastery reiterates the assertion that

Valtorta are not supernatural. She claims to have had "visions" and "dictations" from Jesus, Mary, and a holy angel, but the Holy See has always declared that nothing was supernatural. Theologians of the Church have studied her writings and her life and their conclusion is that her work is "literary," her work is not the result of inspiration from God or Heaven. Maria Valtorta's writings are the result of her own psychic faculties, the fruit of her mind. This is why Pope Francis refers to her work as "literary." After sinning by publishing the work without imprimatur at a time when doing so for a private revelation was a mortal sin, Valtortists argue that the Church does not currently prohibit the publication of the writings, since since 1966, disseminating such writings without imprimatur is no longer a mortal sin.

Quoting to prove reading

Since the Valtortists accuse critics of not having read the work, for each error we provide a short quotation, as permitted by French (and European) law on literary property, without seeking permission from the author or publisher. Our intention in quoting is to offer constructive, educational criticism. The aim is to enable readers to gain a better understanding of the Catholic faith by pointing out errors that are foreign to it.

We have only included short quotations so as not to infringe on the commercial exploitation of the work, which comprises 8,468 pages (*The Gospel as Revealed to Me*: 5,000 pages in 10 volumes of 500 pages each; *The Notebooks of 1943*: 632 pages, *The Notebooks of 1944*: 656 pages, *The Notebooks of 1945-1950:* 640 pages, *Autobiography:* 550 pages, *Lessons on Paul's Epistle to the Romans:* 312 pages*, The Book of Azarias:* 370 pages). For each quotation,

we provide the date and precise references in the two French editions.

The (...) indicate words that have been omitted in order to shorten quotations as much as possible, always with the aim of complying with the law and saving the reader time. We reduce quotations as much as possible, knowing that anyone can check the entire passages on the Internet. Everyone will be able to verify that we remain faithful to the meaning of the sentence. https://www.maria-valtorta.org/ValtortaWeb/Oeuvre.htm: on this website, Valtortists have had the good idea of publishing, free of charge and in their entirety, the work of Maria Valtorta, which is still under copyright. Our desire is to bring about an edition of Maria Valtorta's writings approved by the Imprimatur, stripped of all distortions of the Catholic faith and relieved of passages that are offensive or seriously disrespectful to Jesus and Mary. The same should be done for the writings of the Venerable Mary of Agreda and the Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich.

Sign of falsehood: Jesus threatens anyone who criticizes Maria Valtorta's writings with hell or centuries in purgatory

Maria Valtorta's "Jesus" claims that he will punish with hell or centuries of purgatory those who criticize "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" and oppose its publication:

How many will be condemned for having acted badly towards you and towards the Work! The Work, being (...) a means of salvation for those who accept it, a means of condemnation for those who mock it or even simply hinder it (...) each will receive what he deserves, and nothing can change this. I tell you: for some, it will be an eternal judgment. For others, it will be consumed over the centuries, and then they will obtain forgiveness, for they will have atoned. The Notebooks from 1945 to 1950, March 10, 1949.

In a letter dated July 24, 1950, to Bishop Carinci, Maria Valtorta wrote that on February 25, 1949, Jesus told her that those who were blocking the work were committing a *sin against the Holy Spirit*.

(...) whoever rejects the Work rejects me, whoever crucifies the Work crucifies me (...) not one of those who act badly against the Work will be exempt from severe punishment. And you will know the names of your principal adversaries! For their death and its nature will first reveal them to you, and then you will see them where they will atone for their sin. The Notebooks, March 10, 1949. [Thanks to René Gounon for these references].

Italian: (...) *chi inchioda l'Opera inchioda Me, e chi nega questo Pane della mia Parola alle turbe languenti pecca nella duplice carità verso Me-Dio, verso il prossimo suo - ma non uno di chi male opera contro l'Opera sarà esente da duro castigo. And you will know the names of your principal adversaries! For their death and the manner of it will be revealed to you, and then you will see them where they will atone for their sin. Quaderno,* March 10, 1949.

Maria Valtorta had a vision of one of the theologians of the Holy Office who condemned "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" on February 14, 1949, Father Mariano Cordovani, OP, Master of the Holy Palaces, theologian of the Secretariat of State, "principal opponent of the Work," in Purgatory after an "unexpected death from a sudden paralysis without even having time to say 'My Jesus!'" *Letters from Maria Valtorta to Mother Teresa Maria,* volume 2, undated letter, pp. 299-300 [references not verified]. Jesus: "Do you see him? Do you recognize him? He is there. And he will be there for a long, long time, for the sole reason of having fought against Me, you, and the Work, acting against Wisdom,

Charity, and Justice." *The Notebooks*, June 6, 1950.

These hateful threats are a sign that Maria Valtorta's writings do not come from Heaven and are not inspired by God. Neither the *Diary* of Saint Faustina, nor *the Dialogues* of Saint Catherine of Siena, nor the writings of Saint Teresa of Avila or Saint Bridget of Sweden contain threats of damnation or centuries in Purgatory if they are criticized or their dissemination is hindered. In the revelations of Saint Gertrude of Hefta (*The Herald of Divine Love)*, there is the idea that Jesus will take revenge on those who slander his writings (Book I, ch. XV), pervert their meaning (Book V, ch. VII), or distort their meaning (Book V, ch. XXXIV). Now, to slander is to accuse someone of an evil that has not been committed, which leaves open the possibility of denouncing any error that may actually appear in the writings.

The success of Valtorta's writings can be explained in part by the lies of the false approvals of popes and saints

The Valtortists explain, without credible evidence and despite evidence to the contrary, that Pius XII, Saint Padre Pio, Saint Mother Teresa, Saint John Paul II, Benedict XVI, Cardinal Bea, etc. were favorable to "The Gospel as Revealed to Me." For them, anyone of good will is supposed to love these writings. If they do not love them, it is because they have an evil soul and it is a sign that God will punish them severely.

This kind of manipulation is also typical of false apparitions, because God does not ask any Catholic to believe in apparitions, locutions, or private revelations. Even apparitions recognized by the Holy Church are only a matter of human faith, meaning that Catholics do not commit any sin by refusing to believe in them. They are not part of the deposit of Revelation made by God to men through His Holy Catholic Church.

Roman Catholic Church.

Having become Catholic after reading the messages of two apparitions in the late 1980s, I am well placed to know the evangelizing and sanctifying value of these supernatural phenomena when they come from God. I have made several pilgrimages to San Lorenzo del Escorial, Spain, where Jesus and Mary appeared to a stigmatized cleaning lady, Amparo Cuevas, from 1981 to 2002. Although not recognized, the apparitions at El Escorial have been authorized for public worship, and the Archbishop of Madrid has canonically established the three communities (priests, religious, families) requested by the Virgin Mary. Masses, confessions, and pilgrimages are authorized on site, in the Pre Neuf and just opposite.

The other explanation for the success lies in the contempt of bishops and theologians for the supernatural and apparitions.

If Maria Valtorta's books are still selling, it is because very few people in the hierarchy attach any importance to these questions. The devout but not very rigorous 19th century gave rise to a widespread reluctance in the 20th century. Asceticism and mysticism are no longer taught in Catholic universities or seminaries.

I still love certain things about Valtorta

Born a Catholic, I lost my faith as a teenager. After my conversion, I bought the ten volumes of "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," the book by Father Gabriel Roschini, and the one by Jean Aulagnier. I thought I had a treasure. It was only many years later that I discovered the offensive passages.

towards Jesus and Mary and the attacks against the Gospel and the Catholic Church appeared to me in all their clarity.

Unlike my predecessors in criticizing Valtorta, there are things I continue to love in her pages, certain scenes. It seems to me that she sometimes has good intuitions. On the other hand, I find what she writes about Jesus and Mary on Good Friday despicable. Perhaps it is my work on the Bible that helps me analyze how much Valtorta distances her readers from a deeper understanding of the Gospels. She mutilates certain verses, such as those of the Beatitudes. She omits others, such as "my hour has not yet come" from Cana, or two verses about Judas: John 13:2, "the devil had already put it into the heart of Judas, son of Simon Iscariot, to betray him," and John 13:27: "When Judas had taken the morsel, Satan entered into him" (omissions pointed out by Father Guillaume Chevallier). The entire chapter 17 of St. John is simply omitted. She destroys the meaning of several parables (the Pharisee and the tax collector, the worker of the eleventh hour, the lost sheep) or distorts them profoundly.

Jesus becomes a character who kisses on the mouth: men, babies, and at least one boy under the age of 15. He gives leprosy to three men, he takes for himself an animal he has healed, he reduces a pagan idol to ashes (unless he only reduces to ashes the stretcher on which it was carried). Such behavior is absent from the true Gospels but was already found in the Apocryphal Gospels, which were condemned and despised by Christians and by the Holy Church.

The Roman file on Maria Valtorta is no longer classified as secret

The Holy Office's file on Maria Valtorta bears the number 355/45. It is now in the Archives of *the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, in Rome, at the Holy See, Vatican City, Italy. It is available for consultation by researchers.

We have made requests to the Secretary General of the Conference of Bishops of France and to Sister Margron, O.P., President of COREFF, asking these organizations to request a complete copy from the Archives of the Dicastery so that the file may be consulted in France. Its publication in its entirety would enlighten many people of good will who are currently being misled by those who repeat various lies in favor of "The Gospel as it was Revealed to Me." We are contributing to the defense of the honor of Jesus and Mary against "The Gospel as it was Revealed to Me," but we are far from having read everything. It is certain that many indecencies, doctrinal errors, and calumnies against the Church have escaped our investigation. We invite all people of good will to pray and act so that full light may be shed on these texts, which are offensive to our Mother in Heaven and deeply removed from the true Christian faith.

Publication of the Italian originals

To prove our good faith and the quality of our translations of the documents of the Holy See, we are publishing the Italian originals on http://jesusmarie.free.fr/valtorta.html

Is publication without imprimatur the only problem?

In 2025, Valtortists continue to say that "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" was condemned only for publication without imprimatur. The present book aims to prove that the Church's condemnation is based on theological, doctrinal, geographical, historical, topographical, sociological errors and on the indecencies found therein.

The solution consists of producing a critical edition explaining the errors and indecencies.

As Maria Valtorta died on October 12, 1961, her writings, written in Italian, will fall into the public domain on January 1, 2032 (1961 + 70 years = 2031). This gives us a few years to produce a third French translation (there are already two French translations, one by Félix Sauvage and one by Yves d'Horrer) and to compile a critical edition correcting the errors and passages that demean or ridicule Jesus and Mary. This edition could then be approved by the imprimatur. Only what is replaced is removed. The apparitions of Mary of Agreda and Anne Catherine Emmerich are still being printed and published despite the serious doctrinal errors they contain. We believe that it is a true service to the Church to work on editions that are perfectly in accordance with Catholic morality and faith.

On the theological errors contained in the books of Mary of Agreda, see Mgr Ludovic Chaillot, *Les Principes de la Théologie Mystique* (The Principles of Mystical Theology), Paris, Louis Hervé Libraire Éditeur, 1866); a work recommended by Abbé Gerard Herrbach, fsspx, in *Des Visions sur l'Évangile,* France, Eguelshardt, éditions Fideliter, 1993.

On the theological errors contained in the visions of Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich (recorded by Clemens Brentano. These writings were therefore excluded from the beatification process), see Winfried Hümpfner, Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique, November 1924, and an article by Abbé Gautier, honorary professor at the Catholic Faculties and former professor at the major seminaries of Issy-les-Moulineaux and Paris, in the magazine *Le Pèlerin,* November 1970, cf. Abbé Gerard Herrbach, fsspx, *Des Visions sur l'Évangile (*France, Eguelshardt, éditions Fideliter, 1993).

On the sufferings of Jesus and Mary during the Passion: have St. Baptiste Varani translated

The apparitions of Saint Baptiste Varani (Camilla Battista da Varano, 1458-1524), who received magnificent revelations in Italian about the sufferings of Jesus and Mary during the Passion, should also be translated into French and published.

On the subject of the sufferings of Jesus and Mary, we recommend reading

The *Book of Visions and Instructions* of Saint Angela of Foligno (1248-1309),
the *Dialogues* of Saint Catherine of Siena (1347-1380), the *Celestial Revelations* of Saint Bridget of Sweden (1300-1370),
the writings of Saint Paul of the Cross (+1775),
and *A Hidden Treasure (Italian: Un Tesoro Nascosto)* by Saint Veronica Giuliani (+1727), her 22,000-page spiritual diary, which has yet to be translated into French (Joachim Bouflet has translated only short excerpts in *Le vertige de l'amour divin : sainte Véronique Giuliani,* Lazaro Iriarte (1913-1997), 1989).

Performing a Textual Data Analysis

Joachim Bouflet, who dealt with the case of Maria Valtorta in particular in *Impostures Mystiques* (Paris, Cerf, 2023, pp. 79-141), suggests conducting a *textual data analysis* of Valtorta's autobiography and the writings she claims to have been supernaturally inspired. If these writings came from God, their literary style would be different.

The opposite has been proven by René Gounon in: ***Maria Valtorta, Un Monde de Mensonge***, pdf, 53 p.
https://sosdiscernement.org/e-books/
sosd_27_valtorta_mensonge.pdf He demonstrates that all the characters, divine, angelic, or human, heard by Maria Valtorta express themselves by imitating her literary style and manner of writing, reproducing her writing tics. It is therefore the same psyche that produces an identical literary creation and not real voices that she hears.

René Gounon was first the author of: ***Maria Valtorta, the Gospel Gone Astray, Visions and Messages That Cannot Come From God***, pdf, 76 p., available on the website of Father Dominique Auzenet, priest of the Diocese of Le Mans (France):
https://sosdiscernement.org/maria-valtorta-levangile- devoye/

Father Dominique Auzenet is also the author of: ***Maria Valtorta, l'Évangile tel qu'il m'a été révélé (Maria Valtorta, the Gospel as it was revealed to me), a negative evaluation***, pdf, 29 pages.

https://sosdiscernement.org/e-books/sosd_17_valtorta.pdf His

ministry as a diocesan exorcist led him to reject
the idea of purely human mediumship, within
in which demons are not at work. He explains this in his booklet on mediumship:

https://occultismedanger.fr/livrets/rio_08_mediumnite.pdf

Does writing without erasures and providing geographical and historical details prove divine inspiration?

Firstly, the deletions, i.e. the changes to what was originally written by Maria Valtorta, probably because she realized she had made a theological or doctrinal error, were made by her when she typed up the manuscript. If we copy the 5,000 pages of "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" as published free of charge on the website maria-valtorta.org into a single text file and search for "typed copy," we find 78 occurrences. Even if not every correction corresponds to the correction of a doctrinal error, this figure indicates that Maria Valtorta did indeed correct her writing. It is therefore false to say that we are dealing with a text without any deletions or corrections.

Furthermore, Valtortists keep photos or scans of the manuscripts hidden, even though they would be easy to publish. I have seen a photo of a page from Cahier, and that page clearly shows a correction.

Several mediums have demonstrated the human ability to write long texts without any deletions, without this being automatic writing linked to spiritualism. Emmanuel Swedenborg, for example, wrote down his visions without being in a trance and without letting his hand write involuntarily. Mediums are capable of perceiving ancient and hidden facts, but they are not infallible.

Are Maria Valtorta's visions and dictations diabolical?

If Maria Valtorta's visions and dictations came from demons, this would explain her historical and geographical knowledge, as well as her accusations against the Church, her blasphemies against Jesus, the Virgin Mary, St. Mary Magdalene, St. Peter, her serious doctrinal errors,

anti-Semitism, falsifications of the Gospels, etc.

We must acknowledge the powerful appeal of these writings despite the official and public condemnations by the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church.

When Valtortists are presented with serious theological, scientific, or moral problems, they often refuse to see them, even when they are intelligent people who are competent in theology. They have an answer for everything and find justification even for the worst indecencies. Most often, at least in France, they take refuge in denial, refusing any debate or discussion, or quickly abandoning it when confronted with the serious doctrinal errors presented to them.

Maria Valtorta's writings exert a fascination and seduction, and Satan is known to be the seducer. It is therefore not impossible that he is at work here. The enormity of the errors that pepper the work is not enough to rule out this possibility.

We do not know whether Maria Valtorta's work is the result of her human mediumistic abilities or whether it is the result of demonic inspiration. Would it not be possible for the human psyche to access certain past information without the action of holy angels or demons? Are there not examples of such natural mediumship in the history of world literature?

Maria Valtorta's good faith may be complete even if her inspiration came from fallen spirits. Let us not forget that she was also the victim of bad priests who chose disobedience and lies to the Holy Office. Moreover, it is known that Father Berti, her second spiritual father, was in favor of spiritualism.

Did Valtorta understand this demonic origin of *the Gospel as it was revealed to me*? Is this the reason for the "psychic isolation" in which she spent the last five years of her life? Or was it only the failure of the Church authorities that affected her?

Why did "Jesus" not warn Valtorta that she must obey the Holy Office and that her spiritual father had chosen to disobey?

When the Holy See ordered Father Berti to hand over the original manuscripts, he disobeyed and returned them to Maria Valtorta. He had kept the originals because he had typed them. The Servants of Mary never gave the manuscripts, only a typed version.

The problem is that if it had been Jesus speaking to Maria Valtorta, Jesus, who is God, would have known of Father Berti's serious disobedience and would have warned Maria Valtorta that she must not disobey the Holy Office, to whom Pope Pius XII had given the task of investigating her and her writings. But since it was neither Jesus nor Mary who spoke to Maria Valtorta, they never told her that she had to obey the Church and loyally hand over her notebooks and journals. True mystics inspired by God do not disobey.

The Valtortists accuse the Holy Office of having intended to "destroy" the manuscripts. This plan to destroy them is not supported by any vision or dictation from Valtorta. Such destruction would have been a serious mistake on the part of the theologians of the Holy Office, who never act in this way. On the contrary, heretical writings serve as evidence and enable action to be taken. A true mystic is ready to burn everything if the Church asks him to, trusting that the same God who inspired the first writing will

inspire a second time. Above all, he desires to do God's will. A true mystic has complete confidence that the good for souls that his writings could produce can be achieved by other means over which God has control. And he is aware of the relativity of his revelations, of the fact that they can never be necessary for salvation.

Does "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" cause mass conversions?

It is common to read on Valtortist websites or hear this kind of unsubstantiated claim. In France, these books sell continuously and some of the readers seem enthusiastic, but there is no evidence of any significant movement toward conversion to Catholicism in our country or elsewhere in the world. In Europe, Catholicism is dying, but it is growing worldwide. This growth has been going on for 2,000 years. Of the thousands of adults baptized in France, how many have decided to become Catholic because of "The Gospel as Revealed to Me"? How many people have taken vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity or become priests because of the writings of Maria Valtorta? One Valtortist went so far as to tell me that "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" was the source of 50% of priestly vocations worldwide. In France, baptisms have fallen from 400,000 to 200,000 per year, and adult baptisms from 5,000 to 10,000 (cf. Vatican News). The de-Christianization of France continues, and Valtorta is not filling the seminaries.

There are no hundreds of videos on the Internet of testimonies of conversion to Catholicism thanks to the writings of Maria Valtorta. This boast is false.

Does "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" discourage its readers from reading the Gospels?

A French priest with important responsibilities (who wishes to remain anonymous) told me that Maria Valtorta's writings were turning the faithful away from reading the Gospels: "They no longer read the Gospels" (…)
"It stifles spiritual and theological life." I told him that I counted fervent Catholics among my Valtortist friends. Furthermore, the director of a large religious bookstore in Paris says that all kinds of people buy "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," not just simple or stereotypical people. Some readers are highly intelligent and truly cultured, although unfortunately, among those I know, all quickly stopped responding to the arguments I presented to them. It is abnormal not to be able to exchange analyses without insulting the other person or losing one's temper.

A French priest who is a professor of exegesis and theology has criticized *The Gospel as Revealed to Me.*

In 2021, Father Guillaume Chevallier, priest of the Community of Saint Martin and professor of exegesis at the École supérieure de Philosophie et de Théologie d'Évron, published three critical articles on Valtorta in issue 14 of *Charitas* (journal of the Theological School of the Community of Saint Martin, ISSN 2418-070X). We cite his name in the errors where his work has helped us. We deeply regret the insults and personal attacks he has suffered at the hands of Valtortists and the pressure exerted on his community.

Titles of the three articles:

Inspiration in Maria Valtorta. Discerning the origin of the Gospel as it was revealed to me.

https://www.communautesaintmartin.org/wp-content/

uploads/2021/03/DGC-Charitas-14-Linspiration-chez-Maria-Valtorta.pdf

Evaluation of three elements of doctrine from The Gospel as Revealed to Me by Maria Valtorta.

https://www.communautesaintmartin.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/G.CHEVALLIER-MV-II-EVALUATION-DES-ELEMENTS-DE-DOCTRINE.pdf

Psychological aspects of the people in the Gospel as revealed to me by Maria Valtorta.

https://www.communautesaintmartin.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/G.CHEVALLIER-MV-III-ASPECTS-PSYCHOLOGIQUES-DES-PERSONNAGES-.pdf

We mention his name twenty times because he helped us in two ways: either by pointing out a particular error, or by fleshing out our theological response to an error that had already been identified. The personal attacks and insults he suffered at the hands of Valtortists are a sign of the probably diabolical origin of Maria Valtorta's writings. It is usual for such apparitions to cause turmoil, hatred, discord, disputes, and disobedience towards the authorities of the Church.

Does *the Gospel as it was revealed to me* make those who believe in it without reservation evil?

It is permissible to ask oneself this question when reading the slander and horrors spread about Joachim Bouflet and Father Guillaume Chevallier. Why do ordinary Catholics turn into slanderers and persecutors?

The mechanism is simple: first, the Church and the Gospels are discredited to the extent that Valtorta's Jesus explains that the Church can no longer evangelize with the means that have made it successful for 2,000 years:

now "visions" are needed. The Bible, and in particular the Gospels, are no longer effective in touching hearts and convincing people to turn to God and the Roman Catholic Church.

Second, under the pretext that St. John wrote at the end of his Gospel that not everything Jesus said and did could be recorded, Valtorta's inventions are presented as useful and legitimate additions.

Let us add that virulent Valtortists believe the lies of Father Berti, according to whom Pius XII approved "The Gospel as Revealed to Me." The same lies are uttered about St. Paul VI, Benedict XVI, and St. John Paul II.

Yet common sense tells us that these popes, who were well versed in all the workings of the Church, would have had no difficulty in clearing Maria Valtorta's writings of their repeated condemnations and rehabilitating them. Our Valtortist friends have no proof of Benedict XVI's support other than second-hand accounts of a letter that has disappeared, cannot be found, but is said to have been read. For St. John Paul II, they put forward the indirect testimony of the pope's secretary, who allegedly affirmed the pontiff's approval of Maria Valtorta's writings, but if this were true, why did Bishop Stanisław Dziwisz not give the imprimatur to "The Gospel as Revealed to Me"?

The Valtortists' answer is to invent a conspiracy of evil prelates of the Holy See opposed to mystics and apparitions. Why has no theologian been commissioned to correct all the doctrinal errors found in "The Gospel as Revealed to Me"? If St. Padre Pio and St. Mother Teresa were so admiring of "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," why don't their orders organize demonstrations to respond to the criticisms contained in the official dossier of the

Holy Office? Why is no member of these orders working to have Maria Valtorta and her writings officially approved?

Valtortists manage to believe that four popes, Pius XII, St. Paul VI, St. John Paul II, and Benedict XVI, were supporters, when none of them lifted a finger to obtain an imprimatur from a diocesan bishop or to have a favorable article published in *L'Osservatore Romano* or in a prestigious theological journal?

Valtortists become convinced that after so many approvals, any opponent must necessarily be a person of bad faith, a person of ill will, whom it is legitimate to hate and insult.

Scientific knowledge of the visions is not a criterion of authenticity

The historical, geographical, and scientific knowledge contained in Valtorta's visions are presented as a criterion for the sanctity of the origin of the visions. However, even the smallest demon in hell knows all these things and can inspire visions to make them known to a human being. This knowledge does not prove that God alone is their source. Simple human mediumship, without diabolical intervention, can also give access to ancient knowledge.

Furthermore, Maria Valtorta's visions contain scientific errors, but Valtortists prohibit access to their forums, block people who criticize Valtorta, and refuse debate. Thus, admirers imagine that no serious criticism exists.

False appearances can lead to good things

fruits

The Apocryphal Gospels were very popular in their day great success, and it is likely that they led to some conversions, but they were condemned and despised by the Church because they were false and misleading.

In the event of contradictions with the Bible, doctrinal errors, or indecencies, a vision cannot possibly come from God

If an apparition contradicts Holy Scripture or contains serious doctrinal errors or indecencies, immoralities, it is certain that it cannot come from God. Whatever apparent fruits these apparitions may produce.

The principle is clear and decisive, but Valtortists ignore it or disregard it.

Does Maria Valtorta, through her writings, cause people to commit mortal sins of rash judgment?

Even before writing this book, I tried to exchange arguments with several Valtortists, some of whom are educated and honest citizens. They seem to be good people on the surface, but when one criticizes Valtorta's writings, they insult and declare that one is in a state of mortal sin, that God is angry with us, that we are possessed by the devil, that we are in the service of Satan, etc. And they do this without any proof, without presenting any facts, except for our criticism of EMV.

Accusing someone of being in a state of mortal sin without proof is a mortal sin, at least in material terms, according to Catholic moral theology, because it is committing a

rash judgment, which, if made with full knowledge and consent, is a formal, complete mortal sin.

To assume the moral guilt of others without sufficient grounds is considered a serious matter in the Catholic Church. Accusing someone of a mortal sin without proof can seriously damage that person's reputation, thereby violating the duty of charity and justice.

For the act to be a mortal sin, three conditions must be met: serious matter, full knowledge, and deliberate consent (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, No. 1857). Therefore, if the accusation is made knowing that there is no evidence and with deliberate intent, it can be a material and formal mortal sin.

A mortal sin is an act that destroys the grace of justification, that is, charity, in the soul of the person, through a grave violation of God's law, thus turning the soul away from its ultimate end, which is God (No. 1855).

Accusing someone of a mortal sin without proof constitutes a rash judgment (*Catechism of the Catholic Church* No. 2477). Formal mortal sin, if not repented of, leads to eternal damnation (No. 1874).

Saint Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIa-IIae, q. 60, art. 3: *It is a mortal sin to judge and condemn others on mere suspicion; it is a slight matter to begin to doubt the integrity of another on slight evidence; but the sentiment of the one who judges others on slight evidence is aggravated by the gravity of the matter which is the object of the judgment*.

If the accusation is made in error, without full knowledge or deliberate consent (for example, under the influence of strong emotion or misunderstanding), the sin

may be venial, because subjective guilt is reduced.

In cases of culpable or affected ignorance, the sin then becomes a mortal sin for the person who had a duty to educate themselves and acquire this knowledge.

Several people have testified to me that they have suffered such moral cruelties, such rash judgments. False apparitions always give rise to this kind of evil fruit.

The three signs of the devil's presence are hatred, lying, and murder.

The effects of EMV on Valtortists

They believe that:

the canonical Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John) contain errors that EMV came to correct.

The Holy Office, now the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, is accused of being hostile to mystics.

The truth is found in the writings of Maria Valtorta and not in the official Gospels; for example, if she writes that St. Gabriel said three times to the Virgin Mary, "Do not be afraid," while the Gospel mentions this phrase only once, it is MV's version that is true and the Gospel that is incomplete.

Consequently, all the commentaries of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church become obsolete since they comment on a text of the Gospels that is so inferior to that of Valtorta.

Some reject the moral doctrine of periodic continence (as part of natural birth control) and cease all sexual activity with their spouse, in direct application of the texts of MV, while others refuse to pay attention to infertile periods and leave it to chance.

Bibliography

Article on *Maria Valtorta* in *the Dictionary of Spirituality*:

Una moderna manipolazione dei vangeli - Paperback
Gramaglia, Pierangelo; Valtorta, Maria
ISBN 10: 8838491305 ISBN 13: 9788838491306
Publisher: Piemme, 1985.

An article or chapter is dedicated to her in:
"Scrittrici mistiche italiane"
Softcover – December 1, 1988
by G. Pozzi (ed.), C. Leonardi (ed.).

The publishers should be contacted to obtain the literary rights to publish a French translation.

Website publishing Maria Valtorta's writings in Italianhttps://www.scrittivaltorta.altervista.org/

Website in French publishing almost all of her works:
https://www.maria-valtorta.org/ValtortaWeb/Oeuvre.htm

The Nine Notes on True Private Revelations

proposed by Mgr Ludovic Chaillot, in *Principes de Théologie Mystique*, Paris, Louis Hervé libraire, 1866. See Abbé Gerard Herrbach, fsspx, *Des Visions sur l'Évangile*, France, Eguelshardt, éditions Fideliter, 1993.

Revelations must:
1) be in accordance with the Holy Books, the Holy Bible.

2) be in accordance with the doctrine of the Fathers and with previous revelations.

3°) not be verbose.

4) contain no falsehood. The slightest falsehood renders the entire revelation suspect. This note must be observed above all others, as recommended by the judicious Cardinal Bona (...) Turrecremata indicates the purity and integrity of the things revealed as a sign of heavenly revelations.

5) They must not be asked of God, nor desired.

6) The things revealed must be beyond human knowledge.

7) They cause peace and tranquility of mind. Among the favorable signs of the revelations of Saint Teresa of Avila, Cardinal Bona points to the tranquility and joy of her soul.

8) They must not be a source of discord; God is the author of peace and loves unity.

9) produce good results.

Rules for discerning true revelations from false ones

Excerpt from *Précis de Théologie Ascétique et Mystique (Summary of Ascetic and Mystical Theology)* by Adolphe Tanquerey, pss, Paris - Tournai (Belgium) - Rome, Society of St. John the Evangelist, Desclée et Cie, 7th edition, 1923 and 1924. Chapter III. Extraordinary mystical phenomena.

I. Private revelations

1° Nature of private revelations

1490. **A) Difference between private and public revelations.** Divine revelation in general is the supernatural manifestation by God of a hidden truth
: When this manifestation is made for the good of the whole Church, it is a public revelation; when it is made for the particular benefit of those who are favored by it, it is called a private revelation. We are speaking here only of the latter. There have been private revelations in all ages: Scripture and the canonization processes give us examples of this. These revelations are not part of the object of Catholic faith, which is based solely on the deposit contained in Scripture and Tradition and entrusted to the interpretation of the Holy Church. They are therefore not binding on the faith of all the faithful; when the Church approves them,

it does not oblige us to believe them, but merely allows them to be published for the instruction and edification of the faithful: the assent that must be given to them is therefore not an act of Catholic faith, but an act of human faith based on the fact that these revelations are probable and piously believable. Private revelations cannot be published without the approval of ecclesiastical authority (decree of Urban VIII, March 13, 1625, of Clement IX, May 23, 1668). [This changed in 1966].
However, several theologians believe that the persons to whom these revelations are made, and those to whom God makes these wishes known, may believe in them with true faith, provided they have certain proof of their authenticity.

1491. **B) How revelations are made.** They are made in three different ways: through visions, supernatural words, and divine touches.

a) Visions are supernatural perceptions of an object that is naturally invisible to humans. They are only revelations when they reveal hidden truths. They are of three kinds: sensible, imaginary, or purely intellectual.

1) Sensible or corporeal visions, also called apparitions, are those in which the senses perceive an objective reality that is naturally invisible to humans. It is not necessary for the perceived object to be a body of flesh and blood; it suffices that it be a sensible or luminous form. Thus, it is commonly accepted, with St. Thomas [Aquinas], that Our Lord, after His Ascension, appeared personally only in a very rare manner; He therefore generally appears only in a sensible form that is not His true body. When he appears in the Eucharist, this can be explained in two ways, says St. Thomas Aquinas: either by a miraculous impression on the organs of the eyes

(which is the case when he shows himself to only one person); or by the formation in the surrounding air of a real sensible form, but distinct from the body itself of Our Lord; for, he adds, the body of the Savior cannot be seen in its own form except in one place: "Corpus Christi non potest in propria specie videri nisi in uno loco, in quo definitive continetur" (Sum. theol., III, q. 76, a. 8) . What is said of Our Lord applies to the Blessed Virgin; thus, when she appeared at Lourdes, her body remained in heaven, and there was only a sensible form representing her at the place of the apparition. This explains how she appears sometimes in one form and sometimes in another.

1492. **2) Imaginary** or imaginative **visions** are those produced in the imagination by God or by angels, while awake or asleep. Thus, an angel appeared several times to St. Joseph during his sleep, and St. Teresa [of Avila] recounts several imaginary visions of the humanity of Our Lord that she had while awake (Life, ch. 28); these visions are often accompanied by an intellectual vision that explains their meaning (Life, ch. 29). Sometimes, in vision, one travels to distant lands: these are then, for the most part, imaginary visions.

1493. **3) Intellectual visions** are those in which the mind perceives a spiritual truth without sensible forms: such was the vision of the Holy Trinity that St. Teresa [of Avila] had, and which we have reported in no. 1473. [Vision of the Holy Trinity. Once she is introduced into this dwelling place, the three persons of the Most Holy Trinity reveal themselves to her in an intellectual vision through a certain representation of the truth and in the midst of a blaze which, like a resplendent cloud, comes straight to her mind. The three divine Persons show themselves distinct, and, through an admirable notion communicated to her, the soul knows with absolute certainty that all three are one and the same substance, one and the same power, one and the same

science and one God. "Thus, what we believe by faith, the soul, so to speak, perceives here by sight. And yet we see nothing, neither with the eyes of the body nor with the eyes of the soul, because this is not an imaginary vision. Then the three divine persons communicate themselves to the soul, they speak to it and reveal to it the meaning of that passage of the Gospel where Our Lord announces that he will come, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, to dwell in the soul that loves him and keeps his commandments. O God! What a difference between hearing these words, even believing them, and understanding through the way I have just described how true they are. " This soul is in a state of amazement that grows every day, because it seems to her that since then these three divine persons have never left her; she sees clearly in the manner already mentioned that they dwell within her. It is in the most intimate part of herself that she feels this divine company, and as if in a very deep abyss that she cannot define, for lack of knowledge" (Castle, 6th Dwelling, ch. 1). These visions occur either through ideas already acquired, but which God coordinates or modifies, or through infused species that represent divine things better than acquired ideas. Sometimes they are obscure and only reveal the presence of the object (Life, ch. 27); at other times, they are clear but last only a moment: they are like intuitions that leave a deep impression (Castle, 6th Dem., ch. 10). There are visions that combine two or three characteristics at the same time. Thus, St. Paul's vision on the road to Damascus was at once sensory, when he saw the blazing light, imaginative, when the features of Ananias were represented in his imagination, and intellectual, when he understood God's will for him.

1494. **b) Supernatural words** are manifestations of divine thought that are heard by the external senses, the internal senses, or directly by the intellect. They are called auricular when ce are of vibrations

miraculously formed that resound in the ears; imaginary, when they are heard in the imagination; intellectual, when they address the intellect directly.

1495. **c) Divine touches** are delightful spiritual feelings imprinted on the will by a kind of divine contact, accompanied by a bright light for the intellect. There are two kinds: ordinary divine touches and substantial divine touches, which, while reaching the will, are so deep that they seem to occur in the very substance of the soul; hence the expressions of mystics who claim to have experienced a contact of substance with substance. In reality, these touches are exerted on the fine point of the will and the intellect, where these faculties are rooted in the very substance of the soul; but it is the faculties, not the substance, which, according to the doctrine of St. Thomas, perceive these impressions. This fine point of the will is called by mystics the summit of the spirit or the summit of the will, or even the depths of the soul.

1496. **C) Attitude toward these extraordinary graces.** The great mystics are unanimous in teaching that these extraordinary favors should neither be desired nor asked for. They are not, in fact, necessary means for attaining divine union; and sometimes, because of our evil tendencies, they are even obstacles to divine union. This is shown in particular by St. John of the Cross, He affirms that this desire for revelations takes away the purity of faith, develops a dangerous curiosity that is a source of illusions, confuses the mind with vain fantasies, and often denotes a lack of humility and submission to Our Lord, who, through public revelations, has given us everything we need to lead us to heaven. He therefore strongly opposes those imprudent directors who encourage this desire for visions. "They encourage them," he says, "to

deal with these visions in one way or another, which prevents them from walking in the pure and perfect spirit of faith. They no longer edify and strengthen them in the faith; and they engage in long discussions about these visions. By doing so, they make them understand that they like them or that they think highly of them; and they behave in the same way? Then these souls, given over to their impressions, are no longer inspired by faith, are no longer empty, stripped of and detached from these sensible things... Where is the humility of this soul, since it believes that there is something good in this, and even imagines that God is making a special case of it? Since these confessors find themselves before souls who are the object of divine manifestations, they use them, asking them to serve as intermediaries so that God may make known to them this or that, for themselves or for others. These souls are then foolish enough to take on this service... The truth is that this does not please God, and He does not desire it in any way" (Ascent of Mount Carmel, Book 2, Chapter 16). Moreover, these visions are subject to many illusions; that is why rules must be given to discern the true from the false.

2° Rules for discerning revelations

1497. In order to discern true revelations and to recognize the human element that can creep into them, it is important to establish rules that are as precise as possible. These rules concern the person who receives revelations, the object to which they refer, the effects they produce, and the signs that accompany them.

A) Rules concerning the person favored with revelations 1498. God can undoubtedly make revelations to whomever He pleases, evento sinners sinners ; but he not the usually only to people who are not only fervent, but already elevated to a mystical state. Moreover, even to interpret true revelations, it is necessary to know the qualities and faults of the people who

believe themselves to be favored with revelations. To do this, it is necessary to study their natural and supernatural qualities.

a) Natural qualities:

1) from the point of view of temperament, are these people well-balanced or suffer from psychoneurosis or hysteria? It is obvious that in the latter case, the alleged revelations should be viewed with suspicion, because these temperaments are prone to hallucinations.

2) From a mental point of view, are they people of common sense, with sound judgment, or do they have an overactive imagination combined with excessive sensitivity? Are they educated or ignorant? From whom did they receive their education? Is their mind weakened by illness or prolonged fasting?

3) From a moral standpoint, is the person perfectly sincere, or does he or she have a habit of exaggerating the truth, sometimes even inventing it? Is he or she calm or passionate in character? The answer to these questions will certainly not prove the existence or non-existence of a revelation, but it will be very helpful in judging the value of the testimony given by visionaries.

1499. **b) As for supernatural qualities**, we will examine whether the person:

1) is endowed with solid, long-proven **virtue**, or only with a more or less noticeable fervor;

2) whether she has sincere, profound **humility**, or whether, on the contrary, she likes to put herself forward and tell everyone about her spiritual favors; true humility is the touchstone of holiness, and if it is lacking, it is a very bad sign;

3) whether they make their revelations known to their director, instead of communicating them to other people, and whether they follow his advice with docility;

4) if she has already gone through passive trials and the first degrees of contemplation; if, above all, she has ecstasies in her life, that is, if she practices the virtues to a heroic degree: for God generally reserves these visions for perfect souls.

1500. **Let us note well that the presence of these qualities does not prove the existence of a revelation**, but makes the witness of the visionary more credible; and that their absence, without proving its non-existence, makes it unlikely. Moreover, the information thus obtained will make it easier to discover the lies or illusions of pretended visionaries. There are indeed those who, out of pride and to make themselves appear important, deliberately simulate ecstasies and visions (such was the case of Madeleine de la Croix, a Franciscan nun from Cordoba in the 16th century, who, after giving herself to the devil in her childhood, entered a convent at the age of seventeen and was abbess of her monastery three times. Aided by the devil, she simulated all kinds of mystical phenomena, ecstasies, levitation, stigmata, revelations, and prophecies that came true several times. Believing herself to be on the verge of death, she made confessions, then recanted them, was exorcised, and locked up in another convent of her order. Cf. POULAIN, Grâces d'oraison, chXXI, n. 36.). Others, more numerous, delude themselves, thanks to a vivid imagination, and take their own thoughts for visions or inner words (St. Teresa speaks of this several times: "There are people—I have known not three or four, but a great number—who, as a result of the weakness of their imagination or the activity of their understanding, or for some other reason I do not know, find themselves so filled with phantoms de l'imagination that they believe they see

really everything they think." (Château, 6th Dem., ch9).

B) Rules concerning the subject matter of revelations.

1501. It is especially on this point that attention must be focused: for any revelation contrary to faith or morals must be rejected without mercy, according to the unanimous teaching of the Doctors, based on these words of St. Paul: "Even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you a gospel other than the one we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (Galatians 1:8). God cannot contradict himself or reveal things contrary to what he teaches us through his Church. From this we derive a number of rules which we shall now recall.

a) Any private revelation that contradicts a truth of faith must be regarded as false: such are, for example, the so-called spirit revelations that deny several of our dogmas, in particular the eternity of hell. The same is true if they are opposed to the unanimous teaching of the Fathers and Theologians, which is one of the forms of the ordinary magisterium of the Church. If it is a matter of a controversial opinion among theologians, any revelation that claims to provide a solution must be regarded with suspicion, for example, one that settles the controversy between Thomists and Molinists: God does not usually pronounce on questions of this kind.

1502. **b) One must also reject any vision that would be contrary to the laws of morality or decency**: for example, apparitions of naked human forms, trivial or immodest language, minute or detailed descriptions of shameful vices, which can only offend modesty (Thus, in the mid-19th century, a clairvoyant named Cantianille gained the confidence of a pious bishop who published a supposed revelation containing a horrible description of the morals of the priests of his diocese

; he was soon forced to resign. (POULAIN, op. cit. chXXII). It is perhaps for this reason that the publication of Melanie's Secret was prohibited. This is true to varying degrees of most modern so-called visionaries, in whom ridicule borders on childishness or impropriety.). God, who makes revelations only for the good of souls, cannot obviously be the author of those that are likely to lead to vice. It is by virtue of the same principle that apparitions lacking dignity and reserve are suspect, and even more so those in which ridicule is evident; the latter trait is the mark of human or diabolical counterfeits: such were the manifestations at the cemetery of Saint-Médard.

c) Nor can we accept as coming from God requests that are impossible to fulfill, taking into account providential laws and the miracles that God is accustomed to perform: God does not ask for the impossible (Thus it is recounted in the life of St. Catherine of Bologna that the devil sometimes appeared to her in the form of Christ crucified and commanded her, under the pretext of perfection, to do impossible things in order to throw her into despair. Vita altera, chap. II, 10-13, in the Bollandists, March 9).

C) Rules concerning the effects produced by revelations. 1503. A tree is judged by its fruit; therefore, revelations can be judged by the effects they produce in the soul.

a) According to St. Ignatius and St. Teresa, divine visions initially produce a feeling of astonishment and fear, soon followed by a deep and lasting feeling of peace, joy, and security. The opposite is true of diabolical visions; if at first they cause joy, they quickly produce confusion, sadness, and discouragement; it is in this way that the devil brings souls down.
1504.

b) True revelations strengthen the soul in the virtues of humility, obedience, patience, and conformity to the divine will; false revelations engender pride, presumption, and disobedience. Let us listen to St. Teresa: "This grace brings with it, to a very high degree, confusion and humility, whereas the action of the devil would have quite the opposite effect. It is so obvious that it comes from God... that the soul thus favored finds it absolutely impossible to see any good in it for itself: it is clear to her that it is a divine gift.The treasures with which this grace enriches the soul, and the interior effects it produces, do not allow it to be attributed to melancholy. Nor could the devil procure such a great good; the soul would not feel such profound peace, such constant desires to please God, such great contempt for everything that does not lead her to him." (Château, 6th Dem., ch8).
1505.

c) Here arises the question of whether one can ask for signs to confirm private revelations.

a) If the matter is important, it can be done, but humbly and conditionally, for God is not bound to perform miracles to prove the truth of these visions.

b) If one asks for them, it is good to leave the choice to Him. The good parish priest of Lourdes asked the apparition to make a rose bush bloom in the middle of winter; this sign was not granted, but the Immaculate Virgin caused a miraculous spring to gush forth, which was to heal bodies and souls.

c) When the requested miracle has been clearly observed, along with its connection to the apparition, there is serious evidence that leads to conviction.

D) Rules for discerning truth from falsehood in private revelations.

1506. A revelation can be true in substance and yet mixed with incidental errors. God does not multiply miracles without reason, nor does he correct prejudices or errors that may be found in the minds of visionaries: he has their spiritual good in view, not their intellectual formation. We will understand this better by analyzing the main causes of errors found in some private revelations. a) The first cause is the mixture of human activity with the supernatural action of God, especially if the imagination and the mind are very lively.

1) Thus, in private revelations, we find errors of the times concerning physical or historical sciences. St. Frances of Rome claims to have seen a crystal sky between the starry sky and the empyrean, and attributes the blue color of the firmament to the starry sky. Mary of Agreda believed she knew through revelation that this crystal sky was divided into eleven parts at the moment of the Incarnation (La Cité Mystique, part II, no. 128; part I, no. 122; this passage is omitted in the English translation).

2) We also find the ideas, and sometimes the prejudices or systems, of the directors of the visionaries. On the faith of her directors, St. Colette believed that St. Anne had been married three times and came to visit her with her large family (BOLLANDISTS, May 25, p. 247). Sometimes the Dominican and Franciscan saints speak in their visions in accordance with the particular system of their Order (Benedict XIV (De beatific., l. III, c. LIII, n. 16) discusses an ecstasy of St. Catherine of Siena, in which the Blessed Virgin told her that she was not immaculate).

3) Historical errors also sometimes creep into revelations: God does not usually reveal precise details about the life of Our Lord or the Blessed Virgin,

when they are of little interest to piety; yet several visionaries, confusing their pious meditations with revelations, give details, figures, and dates that contradict historical documents or other revelations. Thus, in the various accounts of the Passion, many small details recounted in visions are contradictory (for example, the number of blows Jesus received during his flagellation) or contrary to the best historians (BOLLANDISTS, January 13, preface to the life of Blessed Veronica of Binasco; St. Alphonsus Liguori, Horloge de la Passion).

1507. **b) A divine revelation can be misinterpreted.** For example, when St. Joan of Arc asked her voices if she would be burned, they replied that she should entrust herself to Our Lord, that he would help her and that she would be delivered by a great victory; but she believed that this victory would be her deliverance from prison; in reality, it was her martyrdom and her entry into heaven. St. Norbert had declared that he knew by revelation, in a very certain way, that the Antichrist would come in the time of the present generation (12th century); pressed to the point by
St. Bernard, he said that at least he would not die without seeing a general persecution in the Church (St. Bernard, Letters, LVI). St. Vincent Ferrier had announced the Last Judgment as imminent, and seemed to confirm this prediction by miracles (Fr. FAGES, O.P., in the History of St. Vincent Ferrier, explains that it was a conditional prophecy, like that of Jonah on Nineveh; and that the world was saved precisely by the numerous conversions made by the Saint).

1508. **c) A revelation may be unconsciously altered by the seer himself when he tries to explain it, or, more often, by his secretaries.** St. Bridget [of Sweden] herself admits that she sometimes retouched her revelations to explain them better (Révélat.

additional explanations, chXLIX); these explanations are not always free from error. It is now recognized that the secretaries who wrote down the revelations of Mary of Agreda, Catherine Emmerich, and Marie Lataste, edited them to an extent that is difficult to recognize (in the works of Marie Lataste, passages translated literally from the Summa of St. Thomas have been found in her revelations). For all these reasons, one cannot be too cautious in examining private revelations.

Conclusion: how to behave with regard to private revelations

1509. **a) We can do no better than imitate the wise reserve of the Church and the Saints**. The Church only accepts revelations when they have been properly and duly verified, and even then she does not impose them on the faith of the faithful. Moreover, when it comes to instituting a feast or some external foundation, she waits many years before making a decision, and only decides after carefully examining the matter itself and its relationship to dogma and liturgy. Thus, Blessed Juliana of Liège, chosen by God to establish the feast of the Blessed Sacrament, did not submit her plan to theologians until twenty-two years after her first visions; it was only sixteen years later that the bishop of Liège instituted the feast in his diocese, and six years after the death of the Blessed Virgin that Pope Urban IV instituted it for the whole Church (1264). Similarly, the feast of the Sacred Heart was not approved until long after the revelations made to St. Margaret Mary, and for reasons unrelated to the revelations themselves. There is a lesson here for us to learn.

1510. **b) We can therefore only pronounce with certainty on the existence of a private revelation when we have convincing proof**, such proof as is so well summarized by Benedict XIV in his book on canonizations. In general, we will not be satisfied with a single piece of evidence, but will require several; and we will ask whether they are cumulative and convergent, whether they confirm each other: the more numerous they are, the more assurance we will have.

1511. **c) When a director receives confidences about revelations, he will be careful not to show admiration.**
: this would encourage visionaries to immediately regard these visions as true, and perhaps to take pride in them. On the contrary, they must show that these things are much less important than the practice of virtue, that illusion is easy, that they must be mistrusted, and, at first, rejected rather than welcomed. Such is the rule laid down by the Saints. Here is what St. Teresa writes: "Whether souls are sick or healthy, it is always good to be wary until one is quite sure of the spirit at work. That is why I say that in the beginning it is always best to resist. If these effects are from God, they will only continue to grow, for trials make them grow rather than diminish them: this is the exact truth. But, on the other hand, we must avoid constraining the soul too much, as well as disturbing it, for it is certain that it can do nothing about it" (Château, 6th Dem., ch3). St. John of the Cross is even more emphatic; after pointing out the six main disadvantages of welcoming these visions, he adds: "Nothing is more pleasing to the devil than a soul that seeks revelations and is eager for them; this makes it easy for him to insinuate errors and weaken faith, and thus it is most often exposed to extravagances and strong temptations" (Ascent of Mount Carmel, l. 2, ch. 10).

1512. **d) However, the director must treat those who believe they have revelations with gentleness**: in this way he will gain their trust and will be able to learn more effectively the details that will enable him, after careful consideration, to make a judgment. If they are deluded, he will have all the more authority to enlighten them and bring them back to the truth. This is the advice given by St. John of the Cross, who was nevertheless very strict regarding visions: "We have insisted severely on the necessity of getting rid of visions and revelations, adding that confessors must turn souls away from them, far from discussing them with them, and this does not mean that they must be harsh and reject with contempt the statements made on this subject. This closes the door to all confidence; souls withdraw and shut themselves up within themselves, so that they say nothing more; and this can only result in misery" (Ascent of Mount Carmel, l. 2, ch. 20).

1513. **e) If it concerns some external institution or foundation**, the director will be careful not to encourage it without first carefully examining the reasons for and against it in the light of supernatural prudence. Such was the conduct of the saints: St. Teresa, who had so many revelations, did not want her directors to be influenced in their decisions solely by the visions she received. Thus, when Our Lord revealed to her that she should found the reformed monastery of Avila, she humbly submitted this plan to her director, and when he hesitated, she sought the advice of St. Peter of Alcantara, St. Francis Borgia, and St. Louis Bertrand (History of St. Teresa by a Carmelite, ch. 12).

As for the visionaries themselves, they have only one rule to follow: to make their revelations known to a wise director and to follow humbly and in everything the course of action he sets for them. This is the surest way not to go astray.

PART ONE

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE
FEBRUARY 1949
Prot. No. 355/45

BRIEF NOTE [Mgr Giovanni Pepe]

from the Chancellery of the Holy Office, Section "PROHIBITION OF BOOKS" concerning the work "WORD OF ETERNAL LIFE" or "GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST" by the pseudo-visionary Maria Valtorta of Viareggio

Most Reverend Eminences,

The Most Reverend Eminences are aware of the "dictations" and "visions" of the hysterical Maria Valtorta of Viareggio, in whom Father Migliorini, of the Servites of Mary, her confessor, believes blindly. They deliberated on this matter on the fourth day of the week, March 13, 1946, and decreed:
"Call the Father General of the Servites immediately and tell him not to allow Father Migliorini to return to Viareggio, but to keep him either in Rome or in another convent far from Tuscany"...
"Write to the Archbishop of Lucca to appoint a serious and prudent confessor for the visionary, who will supervise her and forbid and prevent her 'dictations and visions' from spreading among the faithful." **The next day, on March 14, 1946, the Holy Father , approved this decision.** And this was done.

Immediately: Father Migliorini was detained in Rome and the Archbishop of Lucca was informed, who, on March 23, 1946, replied that he was pleased, because he considered the Servite in question to be "an exalted person who sees the intervention of angels and demons where there are only manifestations of hysteria." In July 1946, the Father General of the Servites of Mary asked to be able to send Father Migliorini to Monte Senario in Tuscany (a few kilometers from Viareggio!), but naturally received a negative response from the Holy Office. And so the exalted confessor of Valtorta remained in Rome.

But here he made proselytes among his confreres: Father Andrea M. Cecchin, Rector of the International College of St. Alexis Falconieri, and Father Corrado Berti. He even dared to send the Holy Father ten large volumes of Valtorta's "dictations" and "visions,"
" by Valtorta, which have the common title "Words of Eternal Life" or "Gospel of Jesus Christ."

In his letter to His Holiness dated June 19, 1948, Father Berti states that he spoke several times about these volumes to Father Bea, Rector of the Biblical Institute, who—according to Berti—was "very favorable" toward them. And this fact, he adds in the letter (document No. 38 of File 355/45), "encourages me greatly." But is this true?

Father Gabriele ROSCHINI, Servite, Consulter of the Holy Office, in his opinion written for this Supreme Congregation [of the Holy Office] in 1946, judged the dictations of the Seer to be "of an uncommon elevation, disproportionate to her culture, and therefore attributed them to supernatural causes: to God or to the Angel of Darkness disguised as an Angel of Light?" he asked (Opinion of January 1946, page 5).

Valtorta, for her part, in a letter addressed to the Holy Father on November 9, 1948, said: "I have entrusted the writings

to the Order of the Servants of Mary. They are responsible for transcribing them faithfully and presenting the volumes to you as they are transcribed (document No. 31 of File 355/45). Fathers Cecchin, Migliorini, and Berti were therefore carrying out a mandate received from Valtorta, in open disobedience to the decree of the Holy Office cited above, dated March 13, 1946, approved by His Holiness. They even went a step further: they dared to request a special audience with the Holy Father! They obtained it on February 26, 1948, and asked for permission to print the volumes of Valtorta's "dictations" and "visions." But His Holiness very wisely ordered them to apply to an Ordinary in order to obtain the Imprimatur for the publication of the "Words of Eternal Life" or "Gospel of Jesus Christ," which was the object of their interest. And they set out in search of this Ordinary.

However, "having knocked in vain at the doors of many bishoprics" - these are the words of Fr. Berti in the letter he wrote to the Holy Father on June 29, 1948 (document No. 39 of the same file), including that of His Excellency Monsignor A. C. Camillo DE ROMANiS, they thought of affixing the Imprimatur of their Servite brother Monsignor BARNESCHI, titular bishop of Tagaste and Apostolic Vicar of Swaziland (where Migliorini had been on mission), thinking that they could do so because the volumes would be printed in their Order's printing press in Rome.

In fact, this *Imprimatur* appears on page 32 of the advertising brochure, published by them as excerpts from the "dictations" and "visions" (Rome, Tip. Laboremus, 1948) and sent to many people to collect subscriptions and advances amounting to 7,500 Italian lire, the price of the entire work.

* * *

In the preface to the advertising brochure, the publishers say that they must keep the name of the author (the visionary MARIA VALTORTA) secret and incognito, adding: "We ask readers to do the same, without even attempting to lift the veil of this delicate modesty
" (page 5). Valtorta sacrilegiously places shameful words on the divine lips of Jesus in an essay from the "dictations" published in the Giornale d'Italia on October 14, 1948, concerning almsgiving in secret: "Do not reveal your goodness," she has the Divine Master say, "just as you would not reveal a young girl to the eyes of a crowd."

Speaking also of the relationship of the Virgin Mary with the Most Holy Trinity ("Words of Eternal Life," volume 1, 1 and nos. 32-33 and 40 of the aforementioned Dossier), Maria Valtorta shows enthusiasm for the apparition at Tre Fontane. In her diary entry of June 10, 1947 (document no. 32 already cited), she writes: "The apparition at Tre Fontane is not unrelated to the Work" to be published. Even the disciples of Dain Cohenel (Dolindo Ruotolo) say in Naples that the book held in the hand of the statue of the Virgin of Tre Fontane is Dain Cohenel's Commentary on the Bible, which has been placed on the Index! Could the Bible that Valtorta is reading be the voluminous work of the famous Neapolitan priest? Birds of a feather flock together! Valtorta asserts that "the Holy Trinity descended, dwelt with its Three Persons, enclosed its infinity in a small space (Mary's womb); and it was not diminished by this, for the love of the Virgin and the will of God enlarged this space until it became Heaven! The Son taught Mary his truth and wisdom "while he was still only a seed growing in her womb."

Father Alberto VACCARI S.J. speaks with an

authoritative competence on the gross heretical absurdity of Valtorta, who calls the Virgin "Second born of the Father..., because she comes second after the Son of the Father" [the "pupil of the Father"] (page 1 of vol. 1 of the work "Words of Eternal Life," typewritten manuscript), and of her endless errors in her opinion. Let us add here only that Valtorta sees Mary Most Holy "in the incandescent Triangle of the Most Holy Trinity" and warns: "May those wise in theology understand what this vision means... Mary is embraced, I might say contained in the Most Holy Trinity, in which she was before time existed and of which she was the tabernacle, containing in her womb the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, containing Jesus. Revelation is her treasure... There can be no second Redemption to be accomplished by Jesus Christ; but there may be another to save a greater number of souls from the bonds of hell: that of the glorious Mary" (Documents No. 32-33 of File 355/45 already cited).

[These are the excerpts to which Bishop G. Pepe refers: Cahiers de Maria Valtorta, October 24, 1947: "I see the incandescent representation of the Holy Trinity: (...) Mary stands at the center of this divine and resplendent sign, in her most glorious aspect (...) She is contained in the divine Triangle up to the height of her hips. The rest of her body, her legs wrapped in the garment of paradise, stands out against the brightness of the empyrean. The voice of the Eternal Father says: 'This is how Mary is in us. Let the scholars of theology understand the meaning and content of this vision concerning the power and knowledge of Mary, to whom all Love gives itself, to whom all Wisdom reveals itself, and before whom all Power bows down to fulfill her will. (...) I believe that the Most High wants (...) to make me understand that Mary is (...) second after God who is first, but without being like God, who is immense, infinite (...) as if he were watching over her, embracing her with his flashes of love, as his favorite creature among all the children of men, but who remains a creature]

[The Books of Maria Valtorta, Jesus, October 23, 1947: (...) There can be no second redemption accomplished by me, Christ. But there may be another to save a greater number of souls from the bonds of hell: that of Mary the glorious. It is in her devotion

that the secret of the final Redemption lies. (...)"

"This news having been reported on Wednesday, November 24, 1948, Their Most Reverend Eminences decreed: "Make a reminder (to Father General or his representative) concerning Father Migliorini and C. [Cecchin?] in relation to Valtorta... Send the files to Reverend Father Vaccari for his opinion... In the meantime, suspend the collection of membership fees and contributions for subscriptions to the work." **The Holy Father, on the following Thursday, November 25, 1948, approved the decree;** and it was immediately executed. But in the meantime, questions, expressions of astonishment and scandal, and protests rained down from all over Italy on the Holy Office concerning the oddities published and disseminated in the famous promotional pamphlet "Words of Eternal Life" and in a new article in *the Giornale d'Italia*, which appeared, despite the warning given, on Christmas Eve 1948, with this brief warning: "The author is a Christian who wishes to remain anonymous, because the truths of the faith have no other author than God."

Fr. Migliorini, called to order, defended himself by writing in a memorandum (Exhibit No. 54 of the aforementioned file) that "he is neither directly nor indirectly in correspondence with the writer. The parts of the work that were written after his departure (from Viareggio) were not added to the rest through him, at his request or on his advice."

P. Cecchin and P. Berti (the latter traveling between Rome and Viareggio) (Exhibit No. 52 of the same file: "During my last visit," he wrote on November 10, 1948, "I found her (Valtorta) perfectly informed about the layout and various decorations of the cemeteries."

etc. of Rome, "even though she went there 20 years ago." For him, it is a miraculous phenomenon!), sent the Holy Father a statement by Mr. Barilari and G. Milani, associates of the Servites in the publishing house of the Valtortian work, in which they say: "We have made moral and material commitments, which place us in considerable difficulties... Many people harass us every day, asking when the publication of the Work will begin. And just as great is our embarrassment towards those who have entrusted us with money for a publication that everyone wanted and considered imminent, the reviewers (the Servites Fr. Roschini, P. Rocca, examiner of the clergy at the Vicariate), His Excellency the Bishop of Sora, etc., having declared themselves in favor of the publication of the first volume they examined, and many other priests and lay people, pious and learned, having spoken favorably about the publication of the entire Work, of which they had read the various volumes." They request permission to publish the first three volumes, or at least the first, of the work in question. For her part, Valtorta—this time no longer as the "Spokesperson for Jesus," as she had previously dared to call herself, but in the name of the Eternal Father—dares to say with senseless audacity to His Holiness:

> "Invoke my Spirit and read. Read what can enlighten you... The Church of my Christ, misinterpreting the words

of her Divine Founder, believes herself so strong, so invulnerable that she no longer cares, in the majority of her members and especially among the most eminent, to practice those actions that would win her the friendship of God. She presumes. She feels superior to everything and everyone. She says: 'I am established. Nothing will prevail against me.'"

No. Understand the word of God. Do not fall back into the errors of the ancient scribes, who interpreted the prophecies and promises of

according to what flattered their stupid pride as a chosen people... "

"The time of Sobna dominates. A large part of the Church has already been swept away... I already told this to *the spokesman* years ago, so that it might be passed on to you. I am telling this to you today, Vicar of my Christ and my Servant...

But if you reject the means (that is, Maria Valtorta), it is not so much him that you strike and against him, innocent, that you sin, but Me that you strike, Us, who are one God in our admirable Trinity, and you sin against Love. For Love, our Trinitarian Love, has willed to give your pontificate this *Word of God.* And if you resist my will of love, you repeat the gesture of the chief priests, the members of the Sanhedrin, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the scribes..." (documents 60 and 61 of the aforementioned file).

* *

And that is enough. However, may the humble Rapporteur of these *Brief News* finally be allowed to observe: since Valtorta's original manuscripts were not presented to His Holiness, but only their copy transcribed by the Servite Fathers mentioned several times, who can say whether this copy "faithfully" reflects the
"dictations" and "visions" of Valtorta, or whether, on the contrary, the entire original work is not rather a multiple and simultaneous writing by the Seer and her Servite admirers who typed it? Could the Holy Office not, with authority, demand the original manuscripts intact and complete, with all probable marginal glosses, additions, and corrections, in order to submit them to a thorough and thoughtful examination by patient and competent scholars?

Your Most Reverend Eminences will decide by your wise and prudent judgment.

Rome, February 2, 1949.

Sac. GIOVANNI PEPE, Rapporteur"

Summary of the Brief Note

by Monsignor Giovanni Pepe dated February 2, 1949

No. 1: Maria Valtorta is described as a "pseudo-visionary."

No. 2: **On March 14, 1946, Pope Pius XII approved** the decisions taken by the Holy Office on March 13 to prohibit and prevent the dissemination of Maria Valtorta's dictations and visions among the faithful.

No. 3: Monsignor Pepe criticizes as sacrilegious and shameful the phrase that Valtorta attributes to Jesus: "Do not reveal your goodness, just as you would not reveal a young girl to the eyes of a crowd" in reference to almsgiving in secret. Vision February 5, 1945. T2ch63. T2ch98.11.

No. 4: Valtorta asserts that "**the Holy Trinity** descended, dwelt with its Three Persons, **enclosed its infinity in a small space** (Mary's womb); and it was not diminished by this, for the love of the Virgin and the will of God enlarged this space until it became a Heaven.

No. 5: The Son taught Mary his truth and wisdom "while he was still only a seed growing in her womb."

No. 6: Bishop Pepe echoes Father Alberto Vaccari's criticism S.J., who describes as **gross heretical nonsense** the fact of calling the Virgin "Second Born of the Father..., because she comes second after the Son of the Father" [According to Valtorta, Mary is the "second-born" of the Father].

No. 7: Valtorta sees Mary Most Holy "in the incandescent Triangle of the Most Holy Trinity" and warns: "May the wise in theology understand what this vision means... Mary is embraced, I could say contained in the Most Holy Trinity, in which she was before time existed and of which she was the tabernacle, containing in her womb the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, containing Jesus.

[The Books of Maria Valtorta, October 24, 1947: "I see the incandescent representation of the Holy Trinity: (...) Mary stands in the center of this divine and resplendent sign (...) She is contained in the divine Triangle up to her hips. The rest of her body, her legs wrapped in the garment of paradise, stands out against the brightness of the empyrean. The voice of the Eternal Father says: 'This is how Mary is in us. Let the scholars of theology understand the meaning and content of this vision of the power and knowledge of Mary, to whom all Love gives itself, to whom all Wisdom reveals itself, and before whom all Power bows down to fulfill her will. (...) I believe that the Most High wants (...) to make me understand that Mary is (...) second after God who is first, but without being like God, who is immense, infinite (...) as if he were watching over her, embracing her with his flashes of love, as his favorite creature among all the children of men, but who remains a creature].

No. 8: "There can be no second Redemption to be accomplished by Jesus Christ; but there may be another to save a greater number of souls from the bonds of hell: that of the glorious Mary."

[The Notebooks of Maria Valtorta, Jesus, October 23, 1947: (...) There can be no second redemption accomplished by me, Christ. But there may be another to save a greater number of souls from the bonds of hell: that of Mary the glorious. It is in her devotion that the secret of the final Redemption lies. (...)"

No. 9 **On November 25, 1948, Pius XII approved the decisions** to:

1) to remind the Father General of the Servites concerning the priests who are still in contact with Valtorta,

2) to have Valtorta's writings examined by the Jesuit Father Vaccari,

3°) to suspend collections and subscriptions for the publication of the work.

No. 10 **Bishop Pepe criticizes the letter from the Eternal Father, sent by Valtorta to Pius XII**:

[The Notebooks, dictated on December 23, 1948, at 11 a.m.]

"(…) The Church of my Christ, misinterpreting the words of her Divine Founder, believes herself to be so strong, so invulnerable, that she no longer cares, in the majority of her members and especially among the most eminent, to practice those actions that would win her the friendship of God. She presumes. She feels superior to everything and everyone. She says: 'I am established. Nothing will prevail against me."

No. Understand the word of God. Do not fall back into the errors of the ancient scribes, who interpreted God's prophecies and promises according to what flattered their foolish pride as a chosen people...
"

"The time of Sobna dominates. A large part of the Church has already been carried away... I already told this to *the spokesman* years ago, so that it might be passed on to you. I am telling this to you today, Vicar of my Christ and my Servant...

But if you reject the means (that is, Maria Valtorta), it is not so much him that you strike and against him,

innocent, that you sin, but it is Me whom you strike, We who are one God in our wonderful Trinity, and you sin against Love. For Love, our Trinitarian Love, wanted to give your pontificate this *Word of God*. And if you resist my will of love, you repeat the gesture of the chief priests, the members of the Sanhedrin, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the scribes..."

[February 14, 1949: The Theologians - Consultors of the Holy Office]

Feria II - February 14, 1949

Holy Office S.O. 355/45

Regarding the book "Word of Eternal Life," that is, the Gospel of Jesus Christ by the pseudo-seer Maria Valtorta of Viareggio.

The Reverend Fathers who took part in the decision are:
ALL (Assessors, **Morano, Luigi Traglia, Aloïs Hudal, Mariano Cordovani op, Oorr, Augustin Hürth sj, Liburdi, Creusen, Parente, Sebastian Tromp sj, Grendel, Bigazzi, Dalpiaz**):

HAVE TAKEN THE FOLLOWING DECISIONS

1) to oblige the Servite Fathers of Mary to hand over to the Holy Office all manuscripts and copies thereof.

2) That the prohibition of publication of the work be made public because the Ecclesiastical Authority has found errors in it and there is nothing supernatural in these visions.

3) To forbid Father Berti and other religious [Servites of Mary] from having any contact with the visionary.

4) Tell the bishop to place the visionary under the spiritual direction of a prudent and pious priest.

5) Require the promoters of this affair to return the sums of money already collected, while leaving it to the Order (which allowed its members to become involved in this affair) to cover any financial losses.

[February 16, 1949: the Cardinals and bishops of the Holy Office]

Feria IV - February 16, 1949. [Decisions of the Cardinals and Bishops of the Holy Office]
Their Most Reverend Eminences have decided: in accordance with the opinion of the Consultors.

[February 17, 1949: approval [of the condemnation] by Pope Pius XII]

Feria V, February 17, 1949 "His Holiness [Pope Pius XII], in approving the decisions, considered excessive or superfluous the publication of a notification, which could nevertheless be made if those in question did not obey. On occasion, it may be replied to those who ask questions that the publication of the book has been prohibited by the Holy Office because of errors, etc."

Document No. 63 of File 355/45 of the Holy Office on Maria Valtorta
ABOUT THE WORK "WORD OF LIFE" (as announced in the printed text) or THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST (provided for review in a typed copy)

Opinion of Father Alberto Vaccari, S.J.

Expert of the Holy Office

This voluminous work, which was given to me for examination in typewritten form, contains two types of writings, very unequal in length, alternating between visions and dictations. The first type [the visions] refers to events and dialogues between people whom the author gives the impression of having witnessed in spirit; the second type [the dictations] consists mainly of short speeches, exhortations, instructions, or similar utterances attributed to Jesus, and sometimes to Mary.

I. As for the first type, the visions of events and dialogues, it is conceivable and even legitimate to romanticize the life of Jesus Christ (by updating it with modern words and concepts), that is to say, the events of the Gospels are framed by a plot of events and scenes created, in all likelihood, by the imagination. But this can only be done under certain conditions:

1) that the historical element, based on the Gospel account, should take precedence in both length and content; 2) that the part added by imagination should be only a complement (but not a supplement) and that it should clarify the Gospel account and not contradict it; 3) that what is added does not undermine the dignity of the narrative and, above all, of the central figure, Jesus.

Now, once these conditions have been specified, it seems to me that this voluminous work, which has been entrusted to me for examination, has some shortcomings.

1) The heart of the Gospel is drowned and somewhat lost, like a drop of water in the ocean, in a continuous succession of varied events, scenes, and unheard-of conversations: there are also [page 8] many other journeys of Jesus, other miracles, other parables, etc., than those reported by the holy evangelists; in short, it is another Gospel, similar in substance (but not in size or in its entirely modern style) to the apocryphal Gospels of Christian antiquity. It must therefore be treated as Christian antiquity treated the apocryphal Gospels: excluded and ignored.

2) The author never tells us, not even indirectly, how this account can be reconciled with the public life of Jesus in the Gospels, with all the many journeys she has the Savior make to the far corners of Syria and Palestine (from Antioch to Mount Nebo and Masada on the Dead Sea, from Ascalon on the Mediterranean to Aera not far from Damascus). The Jesus she presents to us in deeds and words on certain points is not the one we know well from the Holy Gospels. In the way he speaks of himself and his mission and deals with his adversaries, for example on page 3258 (I am obviously quoting from the continuous page numbering at the top left) [of the typed manuscript given to her], there is no

this "gentle and humble heart" that he himself offers us as a model. In particular, he goes against the entire Gospel tradition with the kind of ostentation with which Jesus, from the beginning of his preaching (page 244) and then very often with all kinds of people, proclaims himself Messiah, and "Son of God," and even "the Word of the Father," and that is why he is even considered as such by part of the population, well before St. Peter's famous profession in Caesarea Philippi (and this is not in the typed manuscripts that were given to me, but I read it in the small booklet of essays entitled "Word of Eternal Life," pp. 21-25. So Saint Peter no longer has the primacy of his confession: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God," and this no longer makes sense, or at least loses its great force, Jesus' response congratulating him on the revelation that came from the heavenly Father and conferring on him the primacy over the Church; so we would have to erase the very beautiful and very justified praise of Saint Peter that the Church Doctor Saint Hilary [of Poitiers, in his commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, 16:13-20] draws from it:
"You are deemed worthy because you are the first to know the Christ of God. Blessed is the Church that has such a foundation" (Breviary, Feast of the Chair of Saint Peter, 8th lesson, January 18).

3) Very often in this very verbose work, the appropriateness that would be expected for a serious subject is lacking, even more so when it comes to sacred matters. For example: [page 9] the extremely precise description of the physical appearance of the Virgin Mary as a child (pp. 17-18); Jesus "kisses on the cheeks" the mother of Judas (p. 349) [78.2], a completely incongruous spontaneity regarding the manner of fishing, and there is an admiring "Oh" from St. Peter in response to: "I have never fished and I am waiting for you to teach me." [of Jesus], and Peter gives him very precise instructions on the art of fishing (p. 258) [58.3], there are many childish, clumsy, grotesque and even indecent scenes, such as the

healing of the Beautiful Woman of Chorazin (always referred to with a capital B: p. 428 ff.) [chap. 94.5]. In this regard, we can note frequent "opportunistic and inappropriate" shifts to sexual subjects, in order to castigate vice and condemn a society as corrupt as today's, but is this a good way to combat this violent vice, by reminding us of it so often and so crudely?

Presenting all these scenes as "visions" further increases the blame that the author deserves, thus attempting to authenticate the imaginings of her fantasy with the seal of the supernatural. However, she herself sometimes shows that she is not sure of the truth of her visions because she says she describes the places as she saw them without being certain that they actually exist. These cannot be real visions because they contain falsehoods.

On page 67, the author writes: "Mary begins to hum (...) she repeats from time to time: 'Jehovah,' I guess it must be a sacred hymn" [chap. 16.2].

This is pure fantasy! No Jew, especially in ancient times, ever called his God "Jehovah"; this pronunciation of the divine name, as has now been demonstrated, has recent origins and has now been abolished in schools as false [“in schools”= among academics and exegetes; Vaccari is not referring to high school or middle school students]. The imaginative author's knowledge is rather outdated. She herself seems to recognize this when she writes: "But this is a gospel for the simple and the little ones, not for doctors, for whom the great majority (if not all) [chap. 312.14] find it unacceptable and useless" (page 1680a, at the end of year II, vol. 3); in short: only the ignorant can believe it.

II. In the "dictations," she then reveals her audacious claim to attribute her own fantasies and errors to the supreme authority of the divine Savior and his most holy Mother.

On page 3249 et seq. (among the "visions"), a topographical fact is asserted that is truly contrary to the explicit statement of the Gospel (John 11:30 [*For Jesus had not yet entered the village; he had not left the place where Martha had met him.*]) is given a petty and insipid explanation or defense by Jesus himself (page 3263)

[chap. 548.20. In Valtorta, Jesus enters Lazarus' garden and the Pharisees witness the dialogues between Jesus and Martha, whereas in the Gospel, Jesus does not enter the village where Lazarus' property is located].

On page 19 [chap. 5.8], let us quote the words of Proverbs 8:22-30, "Jesus said... (to men. You have applied them to Wisdom, but these verses speak of Her, the Beautiful Mother, the Holy Mother"; in good exegesis (and especially in the sense of the Church), it was necessary to say exactly the opposite: these verses speak of Wisdom and apply to Mary.

It is particularly reprehensible that in two "dictations" one after the other, the first from Mary and the second from Jesus (pp. 69-73 and 73-74) , there is an attempt to explain in depth and defend the opinion (which also appears elsewhere, for example on page 346) that original sin, the first sin of Adam and Eve, was the conjugal act performed at the instigation of the devil against God's prohibition; an opinion that is not new, but already known to St. Augustine, who called it "ridiculous " (Commentary on Genesis, Book 11, Chapter 41 at the end), and which has now come back into fashion in certain circles because of the itch that everything related to the sixth

commandment of the Decalogue
["Thou shalt not commit adultery"]. But it can be stated without hesitation that:

1° it has no solid foundation in the biblical account in Genesis chapters 2-3;

2° In fact, [the idea that original sin is the act of marriage] is directly contrary to both the command given by God to the first humans in the first account of creation (Genesis 1:28: *be fruitful and multiply)* and as proclaimed in the presentation of the first woman to the first man (Genesis 2:32-34), in which Jesus himself points to the divine institution of marriage in its purest and most sacred form (Matthew 19:4-6);

3° to suppose a temporary order of continence, that is, the suspension or postponement of the divine order "be fruitful and multiply," as the proponents of this opinion are forced to do, is pure arbitrariness, pure fantasy, it is to introduce into divine Scripture what is not there; and it is not lawful to do such a thing.

This is sufficient to conclude that this work, in both of its constituent elements (visions and dictations), is reprehensible.

Let us add that here and there erroneous theological doctrines are taught or suggested, worthy of censure of varying degrees of severity.

Such is the case with the pre-existence of souls. Of the Blessed Virgin Mary, it is stated with great clarity that she was created "only spirit" before the beginning of time (page 22) [Sunday, August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.] and that then, conceived and born on earth, in her spirit "she relived what her spirit had seen in God before she was conceived"

(page 47).

For all other men, for every human soul, pre-existence seems to be reduced to "a thousandth of a moment"; "for we read that it (the soul) comes forth perfect from the divine thought and that at the moment of its creation it is equal, for a thousandth of an instant, to that of the first man (that is, without stain of sin, in original justice): a perfection that includes truth as a free gift" (page 1574),

> [chap. 290.9: *It emerges perfect from the divine thought and, at the moment of its creation, it is similar, for a thousandth of a moment, to that of the first man: a perfection that includes Truth as a result of a freely given gift. A thousandth of a moment. Then, once formed, it is wounded by original sin.*]

from which it follows that when a man understands a truth, he does nothing other than remember what he saw in God in that thousandth of a moment. The angelic ministry sheds light on his memories and the tempter casts darkness (page cited). Pure fantasy, an error refuted in philosophy! Incorrect expressions in theology, even heretical ones, are: "Word of the Father, Part of God" (Jesus says of himself, page 244),

> [chap. 4.6: (…) *The soul created to be that of the Mother of God! When this spark of life sprang forth from a living thrill of Trinitarian Love (…). Like a petal of a heavenly rose, an immaterial and precious petal that was jewel and flame, that was part from God (…) On a typed copy,* Valtorta corrected this with "the breath of God" (alito di Dio). But this is a serious error because the human soul is neither "part of God" nor "the breath of God"; 114.9 (...) "I am He who is. The

> Thought and Word of the Father (...)" 397.3 (...) *He who has his roots in the Father, and who therefore is part of God, who is of God, you who live by his sap, you whom they would have persuaded that you are in error, you whose eyes are simple but enlightened by Grace* (...)]

Mary can be called the second-born of the Father (page 1); clumsy (to say the least) are: Mary, who manifests "the joy of having made God happy" (page 70) and who would like to sin in order to be loved by God who becomes Savior (page 32); "he who loves deserves everything from God " (p. 281 at the end); "The Word came to earth. He therefore separated himself from the Father and the Holy Spirit. He came to work on earth. "In heaven, the other two contemplated the works of the Word" (page 1070; and these are words put into Jesus' mouth!).

> [207.09: (…) *One day, in Heaven, in the Divine Trinity, a thought arose: "It is time for the Word to go to earth," and with a palpitation of love, the Word came to earth. He therefore separated himself from the Father and the Holy Spirit. He came to work on earth. In Heaven, the Two who remained contemplated the works of the Word, remaining more united than ever to spread Thought and Love to help the Word who was working on earth."*

Such deviations from correct sentiment and accurate discourse in matters of faith do not seem to me to be frequent in proportion to the size of the work; but I must say that I have not read it in its entirety, in depth, except for a few parts. However, what I have read seems to me more than sufficient to formulate the unfavorable judgment I have given above. I will not dwell on the false or inaccurate interpretations of various passages or books of Holy Scripture, which are more

frequent, but also of lesser consequence. This applies, however, to passages or books of the Bible that sometimes recur in the long dialogues of the "visions
" or in the "dictations." Out of respect for the Holy Gospels, to which this work continually refers by its very nature, I believe I must express here, at the end, in an even more explicit manner, the judgment that already emerges from what I have said above: as an interpretation of the Holy Gospel, this confused book is worthless.

Rome, January 26, 1949.

Father Alberto VACCARI, Society of Jesus.

Summary of Father Alberto Vaccari's Opinion

According to Jesuit Father Alberto Vaccari, *The Gospel as Revealed to Me* by Maria Valtorta:

contains erroneous doctrines in theology contains false interpretations of Scripture

.

many from scenes are childish, clumsy, grotesque, indecent

The visions are false because they contain falsehoods.

is a reprehensible work, a book that is not worth worth

is a new apocryphal gospel that must be excluded and ignore.

The Jesus of Maria Valtorta is not the Jesus of the Gospels in his way of:

speak about himself
speak of his mission
dealing with his adversaries.

Vaccari No. 1 Maria Valtorta destroys what is known in exegesis as "the messianic secret."

From the beginning of his preaching and toward all kinds of people, Valtorta's Jesus presents himself as "Messiah," "Son of God," and even "Word of the Father." This behavior goes against the entire evangelical tradition.

This is why Jesus was considered the Messiah and the Son of God by part of the population well before Saint Peter's famous profession: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Vaccari No. 2, which strips Saint Peter of his primacy and makes Jesus' congratulations seem artificial and unjustified As a result, Saint Peter is stripped of the primacy of his confession at Caesarea Philippi
and Jesus' congratulations for this confession seem artificial and unjustified since Peter is no longer the first to recognize Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God; it is no longer a revelation from the heavenly Father since Jesus had been saying this to everyone since the beginning of his public life.

Vaccari No. 3: Many passages are inappropriate
e.g., Jesus "kisses on the cheeks" the mother of Judas [cf. chap. 78.2]

Vaccari No. 4: There are many childish, awkward, grotesque, and even indecent scenes, such as the healing of the woman of Chorazin [cf. chap. 94.5], where the leper healed by Jesus is seen by Jesus, Peter, and Andrew, completely naked.

Vaccari No. 5: There are frequent shifts to sexual subjects.
The vice of lust is recalled too often and in too crude a manner.

Vaccari No. 6: "Presenting all these scenes as 'visions' further increases the blame that the author deserves, thus attempting to authenticate the imaginings of his fantasy with the seal of the supernatural."

Vaccari No. 7: "They cannot be true visions because they contain false things."

Vaccari No. 8: Mary calls God "Jehovah"
"Mary begins to sing (...) she repeats from time to time

: 'Jehovah,' and I guess it must be a sacred hymn" [chap. 16.2]. This is pure fantasy! No Jew, especially in ancient times, ever called his God "Jehovah"; **this pronunciation** of the divine name, as has now been demonstrated, has **recent origins** and has now been abolished in schools as false."

Vaccari No. 9: Valtorta's knowledge is outdated, and she herself admits that only the ignorant will believe her.

believe her.

"The science of the imaginative author is rather outdated. She herself seems to recognize this when she writes: 'But this is a gospel for the simple and the little ones, not for the doctors, for whom the great majority (if not all) [chap. 312.14] find it unacceptable and useless' (...) in short: only the ignorant can believe it.

Vaccari No. 10: In the dictations, a topographical fact is contradicted John 11:30 *Jesus had not yet entered the village; he had not left the place where Martha had met him*.
Valtorta's Jesus has a petty and insipid explanation. [chap. 548.20. In Valtorta, Jesus enters Lazarus' garden and the Pharisees witness the dialogue between Jesus and Martha, whereas in the Gospel, Jesus does not enter the village where Lazarus' property is located].

Vaccari No. 11: Proverbs 8:22-30

[chap. 5.8], "Jesus said: You have applied Proverbs 8:22-30 to Wisdom, but these verses speak of my Mother." Vaccari says that we must say exactly the opposite: Proverbs 8:22-30 speak of Wisdom and apply to Mary.

Vaccari No. 12: Original sin is the conjugal act

Vaccari denounces as "reprehensible" the two "dictations," one after the other, the first from Mary, the second from Jesus (pp. 69-73 and 73-74), where it is said that the

original sin of Adam and Eve was the conjugal act performed at the instigation of the devil against God's prohibition; an opinion that St. Augustine called "ridiculous" (Commentary on Genesis, book 11, chapter 41 at the end), an opinion that has come back into fashion today. But this has no basis in the biblical account in Genesis chapters 2-3, because the idea that original sin is the act of marriage is directly contrary to both the command given by God to the first humans in the first account of creation (Genesis 1:28: *be fruitful and multiply)* and as proclaimed in the presentation of the first woman to the first man (Genesis 2:32-34), in which Jesus himself points to the divine institution of marriage in its purest and most sacred form (Matthew 19:4-6); to assume a temporary order of continence, that is, the suspension or postponement of the divine order "be fruitful and multiply," is pure arbitrariness, pure fantasy, it is to want to introduce into divine Scripture what is not there; and it is unlawful to do such a thing.
"This work is condemnable both for its visions and for its dictations."

Vaccari No. 13: Erroneous doctrines in theology are taught or suggested in *The Gospel as Revealed to Me* by Maria Valtorta

Vaccari No. 14: The pre-existence of the Virgin Mary
The Virgin Mary was created "only spirit" before the beginning of time [Sunday, August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.] and then, conceived and born on earth, in her spirit
"she relived what her spirit had seen in God before she was conceived."

Vaccari No. 15: The pre-existence of every human soul for a thousandth of an instant
For all other men, for every human soul, pre-existence seems to be reduced to "a thousandth of a moment";

"for we read that it (the soul) emerges perfect from the divine mind and that at the moment of its creation it is equal, for a thousandth of a moment, to that of the first man (that is, without stain of sin, in original justice): a perfection that includes truth as a free gift" [chap. 290.9: *It emerges perfect from the divine thought and, at the moment of its creation, it is similar, for a thousandth of a moment, to that of the first man: a perfection that includes Truth as a result of a freely given gift. A thousandth of a moment. Then, once formed, it is wounded by original sin.]*, whence it follows that when a man understands a truth, he does nothing other than remember what he saw in God in that thousandth of a moment. The angelic ministry sheds light on his memories and the tempter casts darkness. Pure fantasy, an error refuted in philosophy

Vaccari No. 16: The human soul "part of God"

Incorrect expressions in theology, even heretical ones:

"Part of God" (Jesus says of himself, page 244), [chap. 4.6: (...) *The soul created to be that of the Mother of God! When this spark of life springs forth from a living quivering from the Love trinitaire (...). Like a petal of a heavenly rose, an immaterial and precious petal that was jewel and flame, that was part of God (...)*

On a typed copy, Valtorta corrected this to "the breath of God" (alito di Dio). But this is a serious error because the human soul is neither "part of God" nor "the breath of God"; 114.9 (...) "I am He who is. The Thought and Word of the Father (...)" 397.3 (...) *He who has his root in the Father, and who therefore is part of God, who is of God, you who live by his sap, you whom they would have persuaded that you are in error, you whose eyes are simple but enlightened by Grace (*...)]

It is heretical to say that the human soul is "the breath of God" in the sense that it shares the divine nature or is of the same substance as God (like the Son or the Holy Spirit). This would be a form of pantheism or monistic heresy: confusing the Creator with the creature.

The "breath of life" in Genesis 2:7 ("God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being") is symbolic, expressing the fact that God gives life to man, but not that the human soul participates in the divine essence. The expression "breath of God" is a metaphor to signify that human life comes from God, but the created substance is not divine substance. God breathes life into man, but this life is not divine substance. Our soul is not divine by nature or derived from the essence of God.

Vaccari No. 17: Mary can be called the second-born of the Father

Vaccari No. 18: Several awkward expressions are found in *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*

Vaccari No. 19: Mary, who manifests "the joy of having made God happy"

Vaccari No. 20: Mary, who would like to sin in order to be loved by God who becomes Savior (page 32); [cf. 7.5 – I would also like to be a sinner, a great sinner, if I did not fear offending the Lord... Tell me, mother, can one be a sinner for the love of God?
"But what are you saying, my treasure? I don't understand."
"I mean: sinning so that I can be loved by God, who becomes the Savior. We save what is lost, don't we? I want to be saved by the Savior so that I can have his loving gaze; that's why I want to sin, but without committing sins that disgust him. How can he save me if

I lose myself?" Anne is stunned. She doesn't know what to say.
Vaccari No. 21: "Those who love deserve everything from God" [ch.63.4]

Vaccari No. 22: "The Word came to earth. He therefore separated Himself from the Father and the Holy Spirit. He came to work on earth. "In heaven, the other two contemplated the works of the Word" [207.09: (...) *One day, in Heaven, in the Divine Trinity, a thought came: "It is time for the Word to go to earth," and with a palpitation of love, the Word came to earth. He therefore separated himself from the Father and the Holy Spirit. He came to work on earth. In Heaven, the Two who had remained contemplated the works of the Word, remaining more united than ever to spread Thought and Love to help the Word who was working on earth."*

Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office
October 17, 1952
Prot. No. 355/45
"WORD OF ETERNAL LIFE" or rather "GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST"
by Mrs. Maria Valtorta of Viareggio

Opinion of Reverend Father Agostino Béa, S.J.

Consultant

[Father Agostino Bea was confessor to Pope Pius XII and rector of the Biblical Institute in Rome. He was created cardinal on December 14, 1959, by Pope John XXIII. He played an important role during the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). In the following text, the words in square brackets have been added by Alexis Maillard; the words in parentheses are those of Father Agostino Bea himself. The original Italian document is published at: jesusmarie.free.fr/valtorta.html].

Most Reverend Eminence,

I have been asked to review once again, following the very humble request made to His Holiness [Pope Pius XII] by His Excellency Monsignor Alfonso Carinci, secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (January 29, 1952), [request] accompanied by that of nine people, [I have been Alfonso Carinci, secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (January 29, 1952), [request] accompanied by that of nine other people, [I have been charged with reviewing once again] the very voluminous typewritten work, *Words of Eternal Life,* composed by Mrs. Maria Valtorta of Viareggio. I have carefully examined

carefully examined some of the 12 volumes and leafed through the others. I also took note of the extensive documentation that exists at the Holy Office. All things considered and with great deliberation, I believe I can state the following, first addressing the author (an important question in order to better judge the origin of the work) and then the work itself.

A / The author of the work

1°) The author was born in Caserta on March 14, 1897, the daughter of an officer who was indifferent to religion and a mother who was opposed to religious practices. She was educated in nuns' schools (Ursulines and Marcelines), where she completed the first three years of elementary school; then the fourth grade, her high school diploma, and some additional classes in public schools in Voghera. From March 190? [illegible] to the end of February 1913, she attended the college of the Sisters of B. Capitanio in Monza, where she studied general culture and technical subjects, graduating in October 1911. At the same college, she took additional courses in literature, art history, and contemporary history. During World War I, she was a nurse with the Red Cross.

2) Having spent almost ten years in religious schools, the young Valtorta must have acquired a considerable amount of religious and secular knowledge, even if, as she herself states, she only studied the Catechism of Blessed Pius X. She returned to her family with great religious fervor and sought to attend Mass and receive Communion every Sunday and on solemn feasts, despite her mother's hostile attitude. She herself said that she read Papini's *Life of Christ* and Ricciotti's [Giuseppe Ricciotti, *Vita di Gesu Christo]*, Wallace's *Ben Hur*, Wiseman's *Fable*, Sienkiewicz's Quo Vadis, and "a few other" novels that were given to her in 1943 by her cousin Paola Befanti, just as the "visions" and "dictations" began.

Sienkiewicz, and "a few other" novels that were given to her in 1943 by her cousin Paola Befanti, just as the "visions" and "dictations" began. The Bible was the book she never parted with for three years, as her famous cousin Paola
] Befanti, who lived with her for 16 months. As we can see, it is absolutely false to say, as the Servites of Mary have said and continue to say, that this Valtorta was deprived of any higher education and that she never read anything other than the Bible and the Catechism of St. Pius X; on the contrary, it can be said that she read quite a few books dealing with subjects similar to those found in the work *Word of Eternal Life,* and in fact, I found in the descriptions of Antioch a complete conformity with *Ben Hur [*by Wallace] that it is impossible not to think of a literary dependence. The corrupt life and customs of Roman times, which she describes several times in the work, are found in the novel *Quo Vadis.* Obviously, a much more in-depth study would be needed to ascertain with certainty the possible influences of the books she read; however, such an influence is very likely and could partly explain the accuracy of many details of art, geography, archaeology, and history found in the 12 volumes she dictated.

In addition, Valtorta, as people who have known her for several years say, is of uncommon intelligence, highly spiritual, deeply religious, and strong-willed. It is therefore not surprising that these qualities are also evident in her work: she is not simply an ignorant woman who writes
"only under dictation." In this case, her deep religiosity must be taken into account. During the long years she was confined to bed by serious illness, she certainly meditated a great deal on the mysteries of the faith and on the life of the Lord. Her work with the Red Cross will have

given a much closer understanding of diseases and suffering. Thus, the vivid descriptions and concrete details can be explained by her internal and external experiences, without resorting to supernatural revelations. His Excellency Bishop Carinci attests to having heard from trustworthy witnesses that the narrative part of her work is due to her [it would therefore be Valtorta who is the author, and not a dictation from Jesus or Mary], who herself affirms that she referred as best she could to what
"what she saw and heard." If this is true for the narrative part, it is difficult to think that it could not also apply to the doctrinal part, which is simply always intertwined with the narrative part and which presents the same particularities of style and thought.

3) An important factor to take into account for the rest of the discussion is the physical and psychological state of the writer. Unless I am mistaken, I do not think she can simply be described as "hysterical": she does not exhibit typical symptoms, especially hysterical fits, unless one wishes to describe any physical or psychological abnormality as hysteria. However, it is absolutely certain that there are abnormalities. She suffers from heart failure, has been bedridden for 18 years, and has other illnesses and fever every day. A cousin, who was very close to her and had stayed with her for 16 months, attests that since the end of November 1943 (NB: the first "dictations" date from April 1943 and the first visions from the end of that year! [1943]) "the ailments she had already suffered from returned with a vengeance, but they had never lasted so long. She collapsed as if fainting because she could no longer feel anything, hear any noise, and remained in this kind of cataplexy for several hours. When she woke up, she had no memory of what had happened to her... and she explained that her mind seemed to have been

in darkness, in complete emptiness, as if in those moments she did not exist" (Paola Befanti, September 21, 1944).

These abnormal conditions are undoubtedly related to a spinal injury she sustained in 1921. Dr. Lapi, who treated her for six years, refers to a
"Three lesions" on the spine, and another doctor [talks about] "Pott's disease" (tuberculosis of the vertebrae); people close to her attest that she suffers greatly and very often from back pain. We now know that pain in the spine, and consequently in the spinal cord, often causes serious brain disorders with abnormalities in intellectual and emotional activity due to compression of the spinal cord and the nerves that lead to the central organ [the brain]. The anesthesia [cf. cataplexy attacks] and the abnormal activity of her imagination during her "revelations" would suggest a disease affecting certain centers of the brain. But here, of course, a diagnosis by a competent specialist would be necessary. One could also see subconscious phenomena with the memory of sensations and imaginings she may have had while reading books containing descriptions of the mysteries of life and the Passion of Christ. In any case, taking all these circumstances into account, it seems entirely possible that there is a natural origin for the phenomena manifested by this author in the states she herself calls "writing under dictation," without resorting to explanations such as hysteria or demonic influences, which, moreover, seem to be completely ruled out by the very content of the work, in which the author generally remains faithful to Church doctrine, even if in more complex cases she occasionally displays inaccuracies or errors.

doctrinal. But on the other hand, we cannot exclude a priori a supernatural influence despite the abnormal physical and psychological phenomena found in certain similar cases, even in persons whose holiness has been solemnly confirmed by the Church. It is therefore necessary to examine the work itself in order to arrive at a reasonably well-founded conclusion.

B / The writing [the work itself]

Valtorta's work shows a deep religiosity and a genuine love for Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the Church. There are some very edifying and moving pages that are rarely found in modern writings on the life of Jesus and other books of meditation. This religious quality, combined with a great ability to present arguments in a lively, interesting, and sometimes even fascinating literary style, explains the great impression the work has made, especially on lay people of great religiosity, and the desire to see it published, which is a desire expressed by many and constantly renewed.

On the other hand, however, there are some serious difficulties that stand in the way of publication.

1) The greatest objection that can be raised against this work, and which must be raised, is, in my humble opinion, the fact that the figure, the portrait of Our Lord, is lowered and immersed in the everyday life of men in an unacceptable manner. It is certainly true that during his life on earth, Our Lord ***experienced all our infirmities except sin (***Hebrews 4:15), tolerating also human misery and the gossip of those around him. But there is another question, which is whether it is appropriate today to present the Lord to men in a way that clearly risks diminishing the reverence due to the man-God. Decency must really be taken into consideration.

that should not be overlooked even in the lives of saints and great figures in history, and even less so in the life of Jesus. This means that even the apostles, whom we all know were imperfect and often lacked charity and humility, but we dislike reading a scene such as the following: " The child kicks Judas's foot, everyone laughs, and Thomas laughs very loudly [he bursts out laughing], followed by Judas's sudden anger, who "grabs the child from Jesus's knees and throws him behind him, shouting." (IX, 910) [New ed. chap. 454.7]

2) The life and activity of the Lord described by our inspired Gospels are almost drowned out in this work and rendered superfluous by an immense number of events, speeches, miracles, sermons, and reflections that are completely foreign to the sober and serious character of the evangelists. The whole thing is described in a lively, very flexible, almost passionate style, there is a danger of setting apart, if not placing above the Lord of the Gospels, another Jesus described in more vivid and attractive colors, causing the Words of Eternal Life given to us by the Holy Gospels inspired by God and at least in part by eyewitnesses of the life of Christ and his discourses to be disparaged and neglected. [Béa seems to criticize the risk of putting the Gospels in the background, in the face of the avalanche of new scenes and new words attributed to Jesus in Maria Valtorta's visions]. The Lord's words in this work (e.g., the Sermon on the Mount or the parables) are no longer the clear, brilliant, profound words of the Gospel, but are verbose, overwhelming the Gospel message and diluting it. It is clear that Jesus, when speaking to the people and the Pharisees, explained things in a much more extensive and detailed way than the Gospels say, but it is unacceptable that he should have adopted a language so different from that of the Gospels as is presented in this work.

3) According to this work, the framework of the Lord's public life comprises three full years plus the months from his baptism to the first Easter (references to the typescript edition). In this respect, the work agrees with many exegetical writings, even modern ones, which accept the thesis of a three-year activity as probable, although not proven. However, in the distribution of the particular events that occur during these three years, the work differs significantly from the opinions of exegetes based on the Gospel itself. In particular, the author adds many material details that are not found in the Gospel at all:

in the first year of public life, she adds a trip to southern Judea that goes as far as Kerioth (60 km south of Jerusalem), then a trip to Lebanon and a
"maritime city" and finally a stay of almost three months in Lazarus' country house near the Jordan River (Belle Eau). In the second year, after Easter, the Lord again made a long journey south of Judea (Hebron, Jutta, Kerioth), and from there went to the region of the Philistines, to Ascalon, a predominantly pagan city where he preached and performed miracles, then to Magdalgad where he covered a pagan idol with ashes [Jesus reduced the stretcher carrying the idol to ashes and charred the bronze censers: cf. Monday, July 16, 1945, volume 3, ch220: "Obey, or I will reduce your vain idol to ashes (...) he shows the copper censers, twisted like dry leaves that can no longer be used and lying on the ground, and the ashes that mark the place of the idol's stretcher) "], then to Jamnia and Modin. Between the Feast of Tabernacles and the Encennies (October-December), he made a long journey through the pagan region of Transjordan: Ramoth (in Gilead), Gerasa (in present-day Dshera), Bostra, Arbela (probably Irbid) and Aera (about 35 km south of Damascus; today es-Sanamen). During the third

year, the Lord went from Jericho to Engedi and Masada (where at that time there was no city, but a fortress with a royal residence of Herod, therefore almost inaccessible), and then again to Kerioth, Jutta, Hebron; He later visited the cities east of Lake Tiberias (Hippos, Gamala, Aphec, Ghergesa), and in Perea, the city of Moab: Esebon, Dibon, Mount Nebo, and Calliroe. In addition [page 7], he was in Nazareth at least five times during his public life, once for several weeks, even though he had been expelled from Nazareth in his first year.

The inhabitants of Philistia, Transjordan (Decapolis, Perea, Traconitida, Batanae, Hauranitida), Lebanon, and Phoenicia were overwhelmingly non-Israelites, pagans. It is therefore difficult to see how Jesus' activity among these people could be consistent with his words: "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt 15:24), given the extreme reserve he imposed on himself in Phoenicia (Mt 15) and in the Decapolis (Mk 7:31). Here the Lord is placed in contradiction with himself and his Evangelists. Similarly, his repeated and prolonged stay in Nazareth is difficult to reconcile with his own words: "No one is a prophet in his own country" (Lk 4:24).

4) The way Jesus spoke. Whereas in the Gospels, the Lord does not want to be called "Messiah" and, after Saint Peter's solemn profession of faith, "he strictly warned his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Messiah " (Mt 16:20), in this work he calls himself Messiah from the beginning, and not only within the limited circle of his disciples, but also on various occasions. He says publicly in the Temple, "I am the only true Messiah" [chap. 518.7], to Gamaliel: "I am the Messiah of the Lord" [chap. 114.9]; and to a peasant who welcomes him into his home: "I am Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah" [chap. 532.6]. He

He then spoke in a language very different from that of the Gospels, more like a theologian: God is "the sublime reality," "the universal reality," "the unique, supreme Being" [chap. 463.2]; God sent "his Word," the
"Redemptive verb" [chap. 469.3]; God "begets only another self" [chap. 487.6]. Generally, the terminology adopted by Jesus is our modern terminology : il parle de "martyr," de
"Christian civilization," "superman" (!) [chap. 461.16], the infinite, the microscopic, and the compass [chap. 464.20. The new translation French translates
"compasso" as compass, but "compasso" means compass and not compass], of "Purgatory," of "very high morality," of "superhuman morality," of "supernatural ends," of "matter" as opposed to "spirit," of "Hebraism" as opposed to "Christianity," of "Mass," baptism with "a non-apostolic but schismatic formula" [chap. 259.4: "you shall not rebaptize someone who has already been baptized, except in cases where it was done with a non-apostolic but schismatic formula"]. We can see here that these are not [page 8] words that the Lord spoke on Earth, as the author presents them, but rather considerations and remarks belonging to a modern mindset, the fruit of reflection, meditation, or reading.

5) The people around Jesus. Among these, Judas Iscariot stands out in a special way, almost as if he were a character in a novel: he is a violent man who even mistreats his own mother, a sensual man, a swindler, a liar, a spy for the members of the Sanhedrin, Satan incarnate [chap. 587.4]. One wonders how the Lord could have called such a man to the apostolate. The Most Holy Mother Mary is (contrary to what the Evangelists say) very often in her son's entourage. Jesus takes excessive care of women and not at all with the reserve he observes in the Gospels. There is a

large number of women who follow him: Susanna, Sintiche, Aglaea, Annalia, Lydia, Niche, Naomi, Galazia, Valeria, Sabia, etc. Here the author reveals her feminine mentality more than ever. Too often she describes the appearance and clothing of women (for example, that of Martha of Bethany in half a page!). In Caesarea, the Lord also preaches to Roman women, often in women's homes (such as at the home of Joanna, the wife of Chuza). A large part of Jesus' public life consists of visits to private homes, receptions, invitations, and activities on behalf of the people, which the evangelists emphasize but which are almost secondary here. This presents a very perplexing phenomenon.

6) The geographical and historical context.

Here we are presented with a very perplexing phenomenon. Upon examining the various volumes, we must conclude that the geographical and topographical references are, generally speaking, accurate. And we are not talking about just a few names, but hundreds of cities, villages, rivers, valleys, and mountains. There are probably few specialists among priests and theologians who could confirm the writer's account on this point. Let us take just a few examples. The end of the journey in Traconitida and Auran [Italian: "Aera"]. This city is now known to archaeologists because of the Roman antiquities that were discovered there, but outside the small circle of archaeologists, very few people know about it. On the road to Phoenicia, the Lord stops at Alexandroscene (now Chirbet Iskanderum), a city mentioned only in [page 9] in some very ancient itineraries. On his way to Tyre, the Lord passes through "Sicaminon," that is, ancient Scycaminos, mentioned by Strabo and Pliny but never in the Holy Scriptures, and to this day not very well located. These geographical indications would suggest that the writer really had at his disposal a

guide to Palestine and Syria (and indeed all these names can be found in Baedeker's Guide) [Karl Baedeker's travel guide]. But she herself says, and others confirm, that she never had such a work at her disposal. Could there have been the intervention of a third party?

But the cause becomes even more enigmatic due to the fact that certain geographical and topographical details do not correspond at all with the situation at the time of Christ. The city of Alexandroscene takes its name, not as was once believed, from Alexander the Great, but from the Roman emperor Severus Alexander (225-235), who had the road cut through the rock of the "promontory album"; at the time of Christ, the city probably did not exist. Leaving Ascalon, Jesus goes to "Magdal Gad." The author identifies this city mentioned in Joshua 15:37 with the Medshdel of today, an identification that has been abandoned because it is irreconcilable with the context of Joshua 15. – The city of Tarichea, located by the author, along with many ancient authors, at the southern corner of Lake Tiberias, whereas today it is certain that it corresponds to the modern city of el-Medsh (Magdala) north of Tiberias [and not at the southern corner of Tiberias]. – These and other examples show that the author follows a topography that has been partially corrected by research in recent decades but is still found in guidebooks and geographical books written 50 years ago.

On the other hand, there are texts in which the topographical identification is correct but the writer demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the details. For example, Bittir (10 km south of Jerusalem) is located "east of the Jordan" [so Valtorta makes a mistake between the two banks of the Jordan, which is a river. The Jordan is 30-40 km east of Jerusalem]. – Silo is located "on the mountain," when in fact it is a small hill. – The Lord passes through Herod's gate , which belongs to 3rd wall of

Jerusalem, built by Herod Agrippa in the years 41-44 (or, according to other authors, under Emperor Hadrian), therefore in any case after the time of Christ. – The author also sees in the mountain of Galilee "the high, mighty mountains of Samaria, whose average height is 500 meters [page 10] -- Elsewhere she speaks of "torrential rains" that fell "for several days" in the Jordan Valley, whereas rain is very rare there and stops after a short time [when it does occur]. -- As for history, the same inaccuracies are found here and there. For example, she speaks of the "Proconsul" residing in Caesarea, whereas the title of this official in the Gospels was "Procurator" (like Pontius Pilate).

We can therefore see that these inaccuracies and geographical and topographical details, which are impressive when only a small part of the work is read, as was the case for me, are less exposed to criticism. [*Father Augustin Béa is referring to the fact that his initial impression of "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" was rather favorable]*, are not as perfect as any information of supernatural origin should be. However, I am still faced with the insoluble problem of the source from which the writer obtained the wealth of geographical, topographical, historical, and archaeological knowledge that this strange work is so rich in. Where did he get all this? [handwritten on the document:] But there is also the problem of the Servites.

> *[Béa may be implying that the Servites are the source of all this knowledge. Father Béa seems unaware the abilities of mediums , whether aided by the devil or not, to perceive knowledge of all kinds. Swedenborg was famous throughout Europe in the 18th century. In*

In the 21st century, scientific studies were conducted on the case of Nicolas Fraisse, a nurse from Lyon, who proved capable of "leaving his body" and traveling to various places, where he noted details and precise information, which were later verified by others. Stéphane Allix hid objects in his father's coffin, and a year later, mediums saw these objects in the coffin. Stéphane Allix had not told anyone about this. Those who believe in reincarnation always offer the same false evidence, where mediums see objects hidden in a particular place for centuries, which are then found in our time, leading to the idea that the person who saw them is the same person reincarnated who hid or forgot the object in that place decades or centuries ago. This kind of information is received through mediumship with the help of demons who inspire visions or revelations whose content directly contradicts the Christian faith and distances people from the Catholic Church.

7) Doctrinal errors and inaccuracies. If this book "Word of Eternal Life" has a natural origin, it must be assumed that the author, lacking theological training, may sometimes make errors and fall into doctrinal inaccuracies. Ultimately, it must be said that such cases are less frequent than one might suppose. However, there are some, as Reverend Father Vaccari pointed out in his expert opinion of January 26, 1949, and as I myself have been able to observe in the parts that I have examined. For example (without repeating what has already been said by Father Vaccari): "only in the killer of the Son of God (Judas Iscariot) did Satan incarnate himself," comparing this unique incarnation of Satan with the unique divine Incarnation [*chap. 587.3: "So also in one will be Satan,*

Lucifer, as he is in his kingdom, for it is only in the murderer of the Son of God that Satan incarnated himself. He, while I speak to you, is before the Sanhedrin. He is busy with my murder and is working on it. But it is not he: it is Satan."]. Jesus said to Mary: "Pray for me at the hour of my death" [cf. chap. 455.5]. Mary thanked the Lord "for granting me perfect love, as perfect as a creature can possess" [chap. 454.3] "God begets only another self" (therefore another God?).

> *[chap. 487.6: "(...) God begets only another Himself, for the Perfect can only beget a Perfect, another Being similar to Himself, so as not to debase His perfection by generating a creature inferior to Himself. Cardinal Bea is right to denounce this doctrinal error, for God does not beget another God, another "Being"; on the other hand, a relationship of begetting exists between the Persons. The Divinity does not beget. The Person of the Father begets, but not the Divinity. God does not beget God; the Father begets the Son, and the Father and the Son are God, but not two Gods. The relationships between the three Persons of the Holy Trinity do not give rise to the begetting of another God, nor of another self, because the Father is not the Son, the Father is not the Holy Spirit, and the same is true of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Each Person is not one or the other Person of the Holy Trinity. God is ONE, UNIQUE. In God, there are Persons and relationships between these Persons.*

Mary did not know that Jesus the Redeemer had to suffer and die ["non sapeva che Gesu era il Redentore che doveva patire e morire"] (IX, 906). – These flaws are further proof that this work, as it stands, cannot have a supernatural origin.
[page 11]

CONCLUSION

1) The supernatural origin of the work "Parole de Vie Éternelle" (Word of Eternal Life), as it appears in the typed manuscript, is, in my humble opinion, excluded. This is proven by contradictions with the Holy Gospels, the manner in which the person and actions of the Lord are presented, and the doctrinal, geographical, and historical errors contained in the work.

However, I say "as it appears in the typed manuscript." It cannot be established how and to what extent the typed manuscript corresponds to the original written by the author herself. Furthermore, on the basis of the documents in this file, it cannot be affirmed or denied—except by a better judgment—that there is any real mystical experience at the basis of the work, which would in any case have passed through the writer's mental faculties, undergoing all the alterations linked to her physical and psychological state and her mental faculties.

The writing, as it stands, could in no way, even in this supposition, be called "dictation" or "vision."

However, what we find in the work can also be explained in large part by the author's physical and mental state, her intellectual, emotional, and literary abilities, and her personal experience.

I cannot offer any explanation in the current state of the documentation, given the conjectures relating to geographical, topographical, and historical data, which are surprising not only for their abundance but also for the accuracy of so many details that are difficult for a non-specialist to access.

2) As for the decisions to be made, it seems to me that nothing more can be said than DECISION IN

SUSPENS [“IN DECISIS” translation: to be decided]. In particular:

a) the work cannot be published as it stands because of the theological and exegetical difficulties that have been pointed out.

b) It is not even possible to correct the work because it is not enough to correct a few errors here and there; rather, it would have to be completely rewritten in accordance with the data of the Holy Gospels and the style of the speeches and narratives contained in the Gospel, which would mean writing a new work; [page 12]

c) At most, one could concede or rather tolerate the publication as an article of one or two passages for which there are no objections; but this concession would be inappropriate given the untimely and imprudent fervor of those who support this work;

d) The Reverend Servite Fathers [of Mary] who have so far taken an interest in the work should be given a serious warning and forbidden to support it, either publicly or privately.

Except for a better judgment in the future. ["salvo semper meliore judicio" formula of style]

May Your Eminence deign to consider me as your servant
(handwritten signature of Agostino Béa) Agostino
Béa. Consul

Rome, October 17, 1952.

END OF THE OPINION OF FATHER AGOSTINO BEA
CONFESSOR TO POPE PIUS XII – RECTOR OF THE
OF ROME

Summary of the Opinion of Father Agostino Béa

"**The supernatural origin of the work (...) is excluded**. This is proven by:

contradictions with the Holy Gospels,
the way of presenting the person of the Lord, the way of presenting the actions of the Lord, doctrinal errors,
geographical errors,
historical errors contained in the work.

Valtorta's descriptions of Antioch are those of the novel *Ben Hur* written by Wallace.

His description of life and customs in Roman times can be found in the novel *Quo Vadis*.

"The life and activity of the Lord as described in our inspired Gospels are almost drowned out in this work and rendered superfluous by an immense number of events, speeches, miracles, sermons, and reflections that are completely foreign to the sober and serious character of the evangelists."

"There is a danger of placing (...) another Jesus above the Lord of the Gospels (...) causing the words (...) of the Gospels to be disparaged and neglected."

"The Lord's discourses in this work (e.g., the Sermon on the Mount or the parables) are no longer the clear, brilliant, profound words of the Gospel, but are verbose, overwhelming the Gospel discourse and diluting it."

"It is intolerable that he should have adopted a language so different from that of the Gospels as is evident in this work."

"The Lord is placed in contradiction with himself and his evangelists" on:

Nazareth:

-Jesus "was in Nazareth during his public life at least five times, once for several weeks, even though he had been expelled from Nazareth in the first year." Contradiction with Matthew 8:20 "the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head" and John 4:44 "no one is a prophet in his own country."

The fact that he was sent primarily to the Jews (and not to the Gentiles):

The inhabitants of Philistia, Transjordan (Decapolis, Perea, Traconitis, Batanae, Hauranitis), Lebanon, and Phoenicia were mostly non-Israelites, pagans. It is therefore difficult to see how Jesus' activity among these people could be consistent with his words: "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 15:24), given the extreme reserve he imposed on himself in Phoenicia (Matthew 15) and in the Decapolis (Mark 7:31).

the fact that instead of preaching mainly to the people, he preached in private homes

the fact that the Virgin Mary was so close to him during his public life

"The Most Holy Mother Mary is (contrary to what the Evangelists say) very often in the company of her son."

The fact that Valtorta's Jesus contradicts the "messianic secret"

In the Gospel, Jesus constantly asks that his identity as the Messiah be hidden. This is what exegetes call "the

messianic secret." In Valtorta, Jesus continually announces it to everyone. "While in the Gospels, the Lord does not want to be called 'Messiah' and after St. Peter's solemn profession of faith, 'he commands his disciples not to tell anyone that he is the Messiah " (Mt 16:20), in this work he calls himself the Messiah from the beginning, and this not only within the limited circle of his disciples, but also on various occasions. He says publicly in the Temple, "I am the only true Messiah" [chap. 518.7], to Gamaliel: "I am the Messiah of the Lord" [chap. 114.9]; and to a peasant who welcomes him into his home: "I am Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah" [chap. 532.6].

The fact that the language used by Valtorta's Jesus is not that of the Gospels

"[Jesus] then speaks in a language very different from that of the Gospels, more like a theologian:

God is "the sublime reality,"

"the universal reality," "the One, Supreme Being" [chap. 463.2];

God has sent "his Word," the "redeeming Word" [chap. 469.3];

God "begets only another self" [chap. 487.6].

Generally, the terminology adopted by Jesus is our modern terminology:

he speaks of "martyrdom,"

"Christian civilization,"

of "superman" (!) [chap. 461.16], of the

infinite,

the microscopic, and

the compass [chap. 464.20. The new French translation translates "compasso" as

compas, but compasso means compass and not compas],

of "Purgatory,"

of "very high morality,"

of "superhuman morality," of
"supernatural ends,"
of "matter" as opposed to "spirit,"
of "Hebraism" in opposition to "Christianity,"
of the "Mass,"
baptism with "a non-apostolic but schismatic formula" [chap. 259.4: "you shall not rebaptize someone who is already baptized, except in the case where he has been baptized with a non-apostolic but schismatic formula"].

We can see here that these are not words that the Lord would have spoken on Earth, as the author presents them, but rather considerations and remarks belonging to a modern mindset, the fruit of reflection, meditation, or reading.

The character of Judas Iscariot is almost romanticized: he is a violent man who mistreats even his own mother, a sensual man, a swindler, a liar, a spy for the members of the Sanhedrin, Satan incarnate [chap. 587.4]. One wonders how the Lord could have called such a man to the apostolate.

"**Jesus deals with women in an excessive manner** and not at all with the reserve he observes in the Gospels."
"These geographical references would suggest that the writer really had a guidebook of Palestine and Syria at his disposal (and indeed all these names are found in Baedeker's Guide) [Karl Baedeker's Travel Guide]. But she herself says, and others confirm, that she never had such a work at her disposal. Could there therefore have been the intervention of a third party?"

"(...) **certain geographical and topographical details do not correspond at all with the situation at the time of Christ."**

The city of **Alexandroscene** probably did not exist at the time of Christ.
"Leaving Ascalon, Jesus goes to **'Magdal Gad**'. The author identifies this city mentioned in Joshua 15:37 with the Medshdel of today, an identification that has been abandoned because it is irreconcilable with the context of Joshua 15."
"The city of **Tarichea**, located by the author, along with many ancient authors, at the southern corner of Lake Tiberias, whereas today it is certain that it corresponds to the modern city of el-Medsh (Magdala) north of Tiberias [and not at the southern corner of Tiberias]."
"The author follows a topography that has been partially corrected by research in recent decades but is still found in guidebooks and geographical books written 50 years ago."
"There are texts in which the topographical identification is correct, but the writer demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the details.
For example, **Bittir** (10 km south of Jerusalem) is located by Valtorta "east of the Jordan River."
"**Silo** is located 'on the mountain', when in fact it is a small hill."

"The Lord passes through **Herod's Gate**, which belongs to the third wall of Jerusalem, built by Herod Agrippa in 41-44 (or, according to other authors, under Emperor Hadrian), and therefore in any case after the time of Christ."

"The author also sees in the mountain of Galilee **'the high, mighty mountains of Samaria,** even though their average height is 500 meters.'" "She speaks of
"torrential rains" that occurred " for several

days" in the **Jordan Valley**, where rain is very rare and stops quickly [when it does occur]."
"As for the history, the same inaccuracies are found here and there." "She speaks of the 'Proconsul' residing in Caesarea, whereas the title of this official in the Gospels was 'Procurator' (like Pontius Pilate)."
"This geographical and topographical information (...) is not as perfect as any information of supernatural origin should be."
The four doctrinal errors he finds:
Doctrinal error No. 1: Satan incarnate in Judas
Doctrinal error No. 2: "Jesus said to Mary: 'Pray for me at the hour of my death' [455.5]."
Doctrinal error No. 3: "Mary thanks the Lord 'for granting me perfect love, as perfect as a creature can possess'" [chap. 454.3].
Doctrinal error No. 4: "God begets only another self" (therefore another God?)
"These flaws are further proof that this work, as it stands, cannot have a supernatural origin."
"The writing (...) could in no way (...) be called 'dictated' or 'vision.'"
"The work cannot be published (...) due to theological and exegetical difficulties (...)"
On the person of Maria Valtorta:
It is absolutely false to say that she read only the Bible and the Catechism of St. Pius X. She read quite a few books dealing with subjects similar to those found in "The Gospel as Revealed to Me." "She is not simply a poor, ignorant woman who writes 'only under dictation.'" It is absolutely certain that she had psychological abnormalities.

SECOND PART

213 Theological Errors, 153 Indecent Statements, 43 Scientific Errors
Scientific, 20 Vulgarities, 7 Anti-Semitism

found in a small portion of The Gospel as Revealed to Me by Maria Valtorta

This list of errors and indecencies is far from exhaustive, as only a small part of the work has been examined.

We hope that others will continue this work, as we are giving priority to our work on *The Bible Explained by the Catholic Saints*.

Theological Error No. 1: Mary Magdalene did not touch Jesus, and if she had touched him (after his resurrection), she would have contaminated him.

620.6 - After visiting [his mother] (...) I present myself to (...) Mary Magdalene (...) who represents all female creatures whom I have come to deliver from the bite of lust, so that they (...) may believe (...) that to defeat Satan who searches their flesh, they must look at my Flesh (...). I do not allow her to touch me. She is not the Pure One who can touch the Son returning to the Father without contaminating him. She still has much to purify through penance,

but her love deserves this reward (...) Catechesis February 21, 1944. T10ch6 T10ch620.

This statement by Jesus is contradicted by the Gospel according to John 20:17 and by the Gospel according to Matthew 28 [9]: "And behold, Jesus stood before them and said, 'Greetings.' They came up and embraced his feet, prostrating themselves before him. " Valtorta is also contradicted by a significant number of translations of John 20:17 proving that Mary Magdalene touched Jesus but that he asked her to stop. Here are these different translations:

Do not hold me back: *Bible Tamisier and Amiot, Bible of the Catholic Association for Biblical Studies in Canada, Bible du Semeur, Bible de Maredsous.*
Stop touching me: *Bible Osty and Trinquet.*
Do not hold me back: Ecumenical Translation of the Bible, Bible in Everyday French, New Bible in Everyday French, Bible Parole de Vie.
Stop holding me: Official Bible for Liturgy.
Stop clinging to me: Bible of Jehovah's Witnesses.
Stop clinging to me: New Segond Bible.
Let go of me: Translation by Christophe Rico.

Source: http://djep.hd.free.fr/LaReferenceBiblique/ (This site is wonderful but unfortunately it omits the seven deuterocanonical books, representing 4,562 verses out of 35,526, or 12.84% of the Bible's verses. Someone with good will should create another site that includes the deuterocanonical books.)
http://jesusmarie.com/ bible_et_nombres_35526_versets.html
http://jesusmarie.com/bible_combien_de_versets.html

Readers of Maria Valtorta suffer a second disservice, which is to leave them ignorant of the explanations of this verse by the Doctors of the Church:

St. Augustine. But do we not see that the women themselves, among whom was Mary Magdalene, touched the body of the Savior after his resurrection, before he ascended to his Father, as St. Matthew recounts:

"And behold, Jesus stood before them and said to them, 'Hail.' They came up and embraced his feet and worshiped him." (Mt 28:8)

This defense must therefore be understood in the sense that Mary Magdalene was the figure of the Church of the Gentiles, which did not believe in Jesus Christ until he had ascended to his Father. It can also be said that Jesus wanted the faith that people had in him, the faith through which they touched him spiritually, to go so far as to believe that he and his Father were one. For whoever has made sufficient progress in him to recognize that he is equal to his Father, ascends in a certain way to the Father through the inner feelings of his soul. How, indeed, could Mary Magdalene's faith in Jesus Christ have been anything but carnal, since she still mourned him only as a man?

St. Augustine (On the Trinity, 1, 9). Touch is like the last degree of knowledge; therefore Jesus did not want it to be the last term of Mary Magdalene's intense affection for him, and he did not want her thoughts to dwell on what struck her eyes.

St. Chrysostom. Or else, this woman wanted to behave in her relationship with the Savior as she had before his passion, and the joy she felt closed her mind to any higher thoughts, even though the body of Jesus Christ was endowed with far superior qualities since his resurrection. It was therefore to divert her from these all too natural thoughts that he said to her, "Do not touch me"; he wanted

so that she might learn to speak to him with less familiarity; it is for the same reason that his relationship with his disciples is no longer the same as before his passion, so that they might have greater reverence for him. These words: "I have not yet ascended to my Father," indicate that he is hastening to return to him as soon as possible. Now, it was no longer necessary to see and treat in the same way the one who was soon to go to heaven and cease all external relations with men (...)

St. Thomas Aquinas, in his brilliant *Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, gives the following explanation given by St. Augustine: [Mary Magdalene] *had faith in Christ as a holy man, and that is why she called him "Master"; she had not yet come to know him as equal to the Father and one with God. That is why he said, "DO NOT TOUCH ME, that is, do not make what you believe of me the end of your knowledge, FOR in your heart I HAVE NOT YET ASCENDED TO MY FATHER because you do not believe that I am one with him," which she later believed* (The Trinity, I, IX, 18, Augustinian Library 15, p. 139).

This first error is a good example of Maria Valtorta's theological shipwreck: she writes things that are directly contrary to what actually happened in the life of Jesus and distances her readers from the treasures of the commentaries of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church on the Gospel.

In this first case, she writes that Mary Magdalene did not touch Jesus, whereas according to St. Matthew and St. John she did, and she hides the fact that Jesus' words were calling Mary Magdalene to see in him God made man and no longer just the Christ she loved so much.

Theological Error No. 2: "Mary can be called the 'youngest' of the Father." ("Youngest" means to be born after a brother or sister).

Mary can be called the "youngest" of the Father because of the perfection she received and preserved, her dignity as Spouse of God, Mother of God, and Queen of Heaven: she comes second after the Son of the Father and in his eternal thought, because he has been pleased with her from all eternity. Wednesday, August 16, 1944. T1ch1., T1ch1

On February 2, 1949, Bishop Giovani Pepe endorsed the criticism of Father Alberto Vaccari, SJ, who described as **gross heretical absurdity** the fact of calling the Virgin "Second-born of the Father... because she comes second after the Son of the Father."

The concept of filiation is central to Catholic theology, but Christ is the only Son of the Father and has no "sister." This is a serious theological error because Jesus Christ is the only Son of the Father, in a relationship of eternal and divine filiation; and Mary, although "mother of the Son," cannot be declared to have been born after the Son. This expression leads to confusion that is not in accordance with the teaching of the Catholic Church. Mary is honored as "Mother of God," but she did not receive a perfection comparable to that of the divinity or divine filiation, even though she is full of grace and conceived without sin.

Mary is the "first of all creatures," but she is not the "sister" or "younger" of the eternal Word. This theologically false expression undermines the clarity of the distinction between creator and creature. The Magisterium prefers to call Mary the "beloved daughter" of the Father to emphasize her unique relationship with God the Father. False apparitions like to confuse the minds of the faithful under the pretext of glorifying Mary.

Theological Error No. 3: The soul created to be that of the Mother of God was "part of God."

Theological Error No. 4: The soul created to be that of the Mother of God was "breath of God."

4.6 (...) The soul created to be that of the Mother of God (...) sprang from a living thrill of Trinitarian Love (...) Like (...) an immaterial and precious petal that was a jewel and a flame, that had come from God, that descended to animate flesh in a way very different from that of others (...) it crossed the spaces and went to enclose itself in a sanctified womb. Catechesis of Thursday, August 24, 1944. T1ch6. T1ch4.

Maria Valtorta must have realized that her text was heretical, because the website maria-valtorta.org https://www.maria-valtorta.org/Publication/ TOME%2001/01-006.htm in note [5] explains that she did indeed write "part of God" in her manuscript and that she then corrected and replaced "part of God" with "breath of God," "alito di Dio" in Italian.
Note [5]: "The expression was corrected by Maria Valtorta on a typed copy. She had initially written 'Part of God' (parte di Dio)."

Theological Error No. 5: Jesus "believes" that it was after he resisted Satan's temptations in the desert that "the power of miracles" came upon him.

Response: Jesus always possessed the power to perform miracles and was always aware of having this power.

Theological Error No. 6: "I had been God. I had become Man. Now, triumphant over the animal joined to human nature, I was Man-God."

Answer: Jesus is God from all eternity, so he cannot say "I had been God" unless we accept that Jesus is talking nonsense about such an important subject. Note the strange expression "animal associated with human nature," which suggests that the animal element is external to human nature, whereas Catholic anthropology presents man as a substantial unity of body and soul. There is no duality of two natures: an animal nature on the one hand and a human nature on the other. Man is a rational animal whose soul is eternal.

80.10 (...) "Then came the angels of the Lord... Man had won the triple victory (...) I believe that from that moment the power of miracles came into me. I had been God. I had become Man. Now, triumphant over the animal joined to human nature, I was Man-God. Jan. 17, 1945. T2ch44. T2ch80.

Theological Error No. 7: "It is time for the Word to go to earth." "In Heaven, the Two who remained contemplated the works of the Word."

207.9 *(...) "A trinity, then. One day, in Heaven, in the Divine Trinity, a thought came: 'It is time for the Word to go to earth,' and with a palpitation of love, the Word came to earth. He therefore separated himself from the Father and the Holy Spirit. He came to work on earth. In Heaven, the Two who remained contemplated the works of the Word, remaining more united than ever to spread Thought and Love to help the Word who was working on earth.*
Vision of Tuesday, July 3, 1945. T3ch69. T3ch207.

Catholic teaching on this point: (See articles by Father Guillaume Chevallier)
The profession of faith on the Holy Trinity of the 11th Council of Toledo, in 675, cf. Denzinger No. 531, teaches this: "These three Persons must not be conceived as separable, since we believe that none of them ever existed, never accomplished any work before the other, after the other, or without the other. They are inseparable both in what they are and in what they do (...) Just as we see splendor as one with light, inseparably, so we confess that the Son cannot be separated from the Father." "The works of the Trinity are indivisible, as is the essence of the Trinity itself" (St. Augustine, *De Trinitate,* I, 4,7 and 5,8) because just as the divine Persons "are inseparable, so they work in an inseparable manner" (ibid. I,7). "Leo XIII, Encyclical *Divinum illud munus,* 1897, Denzinger No. 3326). Catechism from the Catholic Church No. 267:
"Inseparable in what they are, the divine persons are also inseparable in what they do." It is therefore heretical to say that the Word came to earth and that the other two Persons remained in Heaven.

Theological Error No. 8: "My Mother loved from the first moment of her conception."

This is nonsense because the human egg cannot perform an act of love. Would the egg that was Mary at the first moment of her creation immediately reach the age of reason without having a brain? To love is an act of the will. How could a cell or a group of two or ten cells perform a free act of love? It is impossible. It is not loving the Virgin Mary to say anything about her under the pretext of magnifying her.

Theological Error No. 9: Mary, "flesh formed around a soul."

It is a Platonic view of the soul as being like a hand in a glove, whereas the soul unites and holds together all the "atoms," the molecules, the whole. It is more like the glue that binds all the elements together, or the string of pearls that unites and holds all the cells together. Philosophically, we say that the soul is the form of the body.

4.6 (...) [Jesus]*: "My Mother loved from the first moment of her conception." What gives the mind light and knowledge? Grace. What makes it disappear? Original sin and mortal sin. Mary, the Immaculate One, was never deprived of the memory of God, of his closeness, of his love, of his light, of his wisdom. It follows that she was able to understand and love when she was still only flesh forming around an immaculate soul that continued to love.* Catechesis of August 24, 1944. T1ch6. T1ch4.

Theological Error No. 10: You applied Proverbs 8:22-35 to Wisdom, but they speak of Her.

5.8 (...) [Jesus:] *You have applied these words* [Proverbs 8:22-35] *to Wisdom, but they speak of Her: the all-beautiful, all-holy Mother, the Virgin Mother of Wisdom, who is personally Me, who speaks to you*. Sunday, August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

The first oddity is that "you" refers to God Himself through His Church, His liturgy, and His Church Fathers; this indicates once again that it is not Jesus who is speaking, since Jesus knows what He Himself is doing through His Catholic Church. Second, this error is one of those pointed out by Father Vaccari in his Notice to the Holy Office: Vaccari says that we must say exactly the opposite of what

says the Jesus of Valtorta: Proverbs 8:22-30 speak of Wisdom "and they apply" to Mary. And not "but they apply" as if it were a mistake to apply them to the Wisdom of God.

Theological Error No. 11: *Jesus says, "To be flesh, I needed a mother."*

Sunday, August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

This is false because God does not need anyone to unite a human body and a human soul. To "be flesh," God does not need anyone, neither a father nor a mother. He wanted to pass through the Virgin Mary, but this was a purely gratuitous choice on his part; God had no "need" for it. He could have created a body and a soul for himself out of nothing, in order to incarnate himself and come to earth like Moses, placed in a basket made of reeds found in the wilderness. God found it more glorious for himself to come through the Virgin Mary, and we are happy about that, but it was not a
"need" on God's part.

Theological Error #12: "To be God, I needed a father who was God."

Sunday, August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.
This sentence: "To be God, I needed a father who was God" raises a major theological difficulty because it seems to subordinate the divine being of the Son to a necessity external to himself, as if the divinity of the Word depended on the prior existence of another divine being, which contradicts the constant teaching of the Church on the nature of God:

1) God needs nothing and no one: God is the very Being who subsists according to St. Thomas Aquinas. He exists by

Himself, without dependence. To say that in order to "be God" He would have "needed" a father is to introduce a dependence into the divine being, which contradicts the immutability and fullness of God.

2. The eternal generation of the Son: the Son is eternally begotten by the Father. This generation is eternal, not chronological, and does not imply any priority of being or time. The Son is consubstantial with the Father (homoousios), fully God, from all eternity. He does not become God by participation or transmission, but is God from all eternity. St. Athanasius, Discourse Against the Arians: "There was never a time when the Son was not," in Latin: Non fuit tempus quando Filius non fuit, or in Greek: οὐκ ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ Υἱός.

3. Inappropriate and potentially heretical language

To say "I needed a father who was God" can be interpreted as subordinationism, an early heresy that held that the Son is inferior or posterior to the Father. However, the Council of Nicaea (325) condemned this position.

The Equality of Persons in the Holy Trinity

The Father begot nothing other than what he himself is; he gave the Son everything that is his except fatherhood;
the Son is therefore equal in all things to the Father and is in no way inferior to him.

This equality is said in particular:
-in divinity;
-in honor, glory, and eminence;
-eternity;
-wisdom and knowledge;
-of will and omnipotence;

Jesus Christ is perfect God.
The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are of one and the same nature; they are consubstantial, co-essential, and co-equal;

there is nothing in the Trinity that is lesser, higher, greater, or smaller.

In particular, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are equal:
-in divinity (they are perfect God)
-in glory and majesty
-in eternity (in the Trinity, nothing is earlier or later)
-they are equally eternal
-none is before or after the other or without the other;
-in immensity (they are everywhere and contain everything);
-in power, there are no degrees of power in the Trinity;
God "is" in his most intimate life the essential "love" that is common to the three divine Persons.

Symbols and Definitions of the Catholic Faith, Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 2001, excerpts from the Thematic Index.

Theological Error No. 13: Transposing onto Mary the role of prototype for creation normally attributed to the Word.

Leo XIII, Encyclical *Divinum illud munus*, 1897 (Denzinger No. 3326): "The most wise Church is accustomed to attribute to the Father the works of divinity in which power excels, to the Son those in which wisdom predominates, and to the Holy Spirit those in which love is distinguished. This is not to say that all perfections and works manifested externally are not common to the divine Persons; for indeed, the works of the Trinity are indivisible, just as the essence of the Trinity is indivisible, because, just as the ***three divine Persons are inseparable, so too they operate in an inseparable manner.***

However, because of a certain comparison and almost an affinity that exists between the works themselves and the properties of the Persons, these are attributed more to one than to the others, or, as it is said, they are appropriate to them: Just as we use the resemblance of a trace or image found in creatures to manifest the divine Persons, so we do with the essential attributes; and this manifestation of the Persons through the essential attributes is called appropriation.

Thus, the Father, who is the principle of all divinity, is also the efficient cause of the entire universe of things, of the Incarnation of the Word, and of the sanctification of souls; everything comes from Him: from Him, because of the Father.

The Son, as for Him, the Word and Image of God, is the exemplary cause, from whom all things derive their form and beauty, their order and harmony; He was for us the truth, the life, the reconciler of man with God, everything was made through Him: through Him, because of the Son. Finally, the Holy Spirit is the ultimate cause of all things, for just as the will finds its rest in its final goal and everything rests in it, He, who is divine goodness and charity itself between the Father and the Son, accomplishes and perfects these mysterious works concerning the salvation of men. Everything is in Him: in Him, because of the Holy Spirit. Problem denounced by Father Guillaume Chevallier.

Theological Error No. 14: Attributing to the Virgin Mary the words of God the Father at the baptism of Jesus and at the Transfiguration.

Instead of helping the faithful discover how the Catholic Church magnifies the Blessed Virgin, Valtorta surreptitiously attempts to glorify the Virgin by clothing her with the glorious attributes proper to the Son. For example, she attributes to the Virgin Mary the words of God the Father at the baptism of Jesus and at the Transfiguration: Matthew 3:17 "And a voice from heaven said, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,'" from the Transfiguration Matthew 17:5 "(...) This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Indecency No. 1: God is making strawberries while looking at the Virgin Mary's mouth.

5.12 (...) I look at you and see you as you will be, O immaculate Woman, who now are only spirit: <u>the spirit in whom I delight</u>. I look at you and give the azure of your

gaze to the sea and the firmament, the color of your hair to the holy grain, your whiteness to the lily and your pink to the rose, similar to your silky skin, the pearls are your tiny teeth. I make sweet strawberries while looking at your mouth, I put the notes of your song in the throats of nightingales and your lament in the turtledove. Sunday, August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

The only Spirit in whom God is pleased is Himself. God is not pleased in any of His creatures. Furthermore, the Virgin Mary did not exist before the foundation of time, nor did any other creature, for nothing is new in the mind of God; everything is present; He learns nothing, discovers nothing; for God, it is an eternal present, simple and perfect. Christian revelation teaches us that Christ was the master model of creation. Valtorta steals this role from Christ and attributes it to the Virgin Mary. This is a theological error that impresses the gullible, who see only what they want to see and no evil in it. But this is a radical change, and the Word and the Virgin cannot serve as prototypes for each other; that would be absurd. We find ourselves here in the presence of an underlying temptation on Valtorta's part to quasi-deify the Virgin.

Indecency No. 2: Jesus the sadist: enjoys scaring St. Peter by publicly accusing him, in a serious tone, of being a "usurper" and a "corrupter." St. Peter: "You really scared me."

199.9 *(...) Jesus stands up and calls out loudly, "Simon of Jonah, come here." Peter jumps up and rushes up the stairs, "What do you want, Master?" "Come here, usurper and corrupter!" "Me? Why? What have I done, Lord?" "You have corrupted my Mother. That is why you wanted to be alone. What shall I do to you?" But Jesus smiled and Peter was reassured. "Oh!" he said, "you really frightened me! But now you are laughing... (...) "Do not abuse your victory and do not*

give the secret to others, you man full of deceit who triumphs over the Master with the weapon of your mother's words. You will have the child, but..." June 24, 1945. T3ch60. T3ch199.

Sadism is a perversion that consists of feeling joy or well-being by causing suffering to others. In their defense, Valtortists say that "Jesus jokes in the way one does with one's best friends, seeming to accuse them of the antithesis of what they obviously are." But the problem is taking pleasure in frightening St. Peter, and Valtorta herself writes that St. Peter was genuinely afraid.

Let us remember that Valtorta's Jesus gives leprosy to three men, kisses babies on the mouth, a boy under the age of 15 and at least three men, including one of his cousins, He reduces an idol and its stretcher to ashes, seizes an animal he has healed, kills Doras suddenly, pinches his nose, and forbids Mary Magdalene to touch him after the resurrection because she is a sinner, etc.

So Valtorta's Jesus has nothing to do with the real Jesus of the Gospels.

On the other hand, this mythological figure of Jesus resembles the one in *the Apocryphal Gospels*, particularly in the scenes of kissing on the mouth in the Gospel of Philip. Valtortists find it funny that Peter suffers, no doubt because St. Peter's moral suffering lasted only a moment. Once again, Jesus is ridiculed and debased.

Theological Error No. 13 (continued): Transposing onto Mary the role of prototype for creation attributed to the Word

5.12 (…) Reading your future thoughts, listening to the beating of your heart, I have the model and guide for creation; Sunday, August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

This is an error because it is Christ who was the model for all creation, cf. 1 Colossians [15]: He is the image of the invisible God, born before all creatures [16] for in him

all things were created, things in heaven and things on earth, things visible and things invisible, Thrones, Dominations, Principalities, Powers, all things were created through him and for him. [17]He is before all things, and all things subsist through him.

Theological Error No. 15: Jesus is the pivot of the Trinity

165.4 (...) you, the Son of God, who are God like the Father and God like the Holy Spirit, you who are the center of the Trinity... Ah I may be blaspheming, but that is how it seems to me, because if you did not exist, you, Love come from the Father and returning to the Father, there would be no Love, no divine Love, and the Trinity would no longer be three in one, it would be missing the most essential attribute of God: his love! May 16, 1945. T3ch25. T3ch165.

These lines minimize the equality, co-eternity, and consubstantiality of the divine Persons: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. No Person is more essential than another. Begetting or procession does not imply any divine inequality. Valtorta hierarchizes the Persons by designating the Son as the "pivot," which contradicts Catholic theology on the equality of the Persons.
Similarly, to assert that the absence of the Son would result in a lack of divine love implies that God's love depends on the existence of the Son. However, love is essential to the very nature of God; it is not conditioned by a single Person. The Trinity is a unity of perfect love between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Theological Error No. 16: Procreation is the sole purpose of marital unions.

5.13 (…) Consider plants in their fruits and seeds. Do they obtain seeds and fruits as a result of

fornication and by the effect of fertilization between a hundred unions? No (...) She does not defile herself by refusing him afterwards, as you do, only to experience the same sensation the next day. (...) Consider animals, all animals. Have you ever seen a male and a female go to each other for a sterile embrace and an impure relationship? No. (...) They perform the rite of fertilization without withdrawing from it at the moment of enjoyment, but they go through with the serious and holy consequences of perpetuating the race, which is the sole purpose. Man (...) should accept the animal act that is imposed on him only for the same purpose (...) if you had been faithful to God, you would have had the joy of having children in a holy manner, without pain, without indulging in obscene, unworthy unions that even animals are ignorant of (...) August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

Catholic moral theology teaches that there are three virtuous and meritorious intentions for marital unions:

No. 1 Procreation: The intention to conceive children is seen as the primary and essential purpose of the conjugal act (Latin: bonum prolis).

No. 2 Strengthening the bond of love, mutual self-giving; promoting unity, communion, tenderness, affection, gratitude. The union of bodies is a sign of the spiritual gift of souls (Latin: bonum fidei or mutuum adiutorium).

No. 3 The remedy for concupiscence (Latin: remedium concupiscentiae): making love to prevent one's wife or husband from giving in to the temptation of an act of lust (consumption of pornography, masturbation, adultery, recourse to prostitution, etc.) is a good and meritorious intention. The conjugal act becomes meritorious when it allows spouses to live their sexuality in accordance with God's benevolent plan. Marital chastity should not be confused with

with continence. Two Catholic spouses who make love with one of these three intentions and using acts that are respectful of Catholic morality are performing an act of chastity. Continence consists of living without any voluntary sexual pleasure. The Catholic Church has always blessed marriages between people who are too old to have children, and marital unions were not prohibited for such people. In Catholic moral theology, three elements are used to judge whether an act is morally good or not: the nature of the act itself (some acts are intrinsically morally evil), the intention, and the circumstances of the act.

Theological Error No. 17: The original sin was the conjugal act.

5.14 (...) O Satan (...) you have corrupted those who were created in a state of innocence, leading them to unite and conceive through lustful means (...) August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

Catholicism teaches that original sin was an act of pride and disobedience committed by Adam and Eve towards God. Original sin was not a sexual act.

Catechism of the Catholic Church on original sin:

§396 God created man in his own image and established him in his friendship. As a spiritual creature, man can only live this friendship in a mode of free submission to God. This is expressed in the prohibition against eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, "for in the day you eat of it you shall die" (Gen 2:17). "The tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (Gen 2:17) symbolically evokes the insurmountable limit that man, as a creature, must freely recognize and respect

with confidence. Man depends on the Creator, he is subject to the laws of creation and to the moral norms that regulate the use of freedom.

Man's first sin

§397 Tempted by the devil, man let trust in his Creator die in his heart (cf. Gen 3:1-11) and, by abusing his freedom, disobeyed God's command. This was the first sin of man (cf. Rom 5:19). Every sin, therefore, is a disobedience to God and a lack of trust in his goodness.

§398 In this sin, man preferred himself to God and thereby despised God: he chose himself in place of God, in opposition to the demands of his creaturely state and therefore in opposition to his own good. Created in a state of holiness, man was destined to be fully "divinized" by God in glory. Through the seduction of the devil, he wanted to " be like God" (cf. Gen 3:5), but "without God, and before God, and not according to God" (St. Maximus the Confessor, ambig.: PG 91, 1156C).

Error Theological No. 18: The celibacy no wanted worth
"less than nothing."

5.15 (…) What is the poor forced virginity of a woman whom no man has married? Less than nothing (…) August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

While the Church teaches that celibacy is more eminent than marriage: Council of Trent, 24th session, November 11, 1563, canons on the sacrament of marriage, Denzinger No. 1810, "If anyone says that the state of marriage is to be placed above the state of virginity or celibacy, and that it is neither better nor happier to remain in

virginity or celibacy than to enter into marriage Mt 19:11 1 Cor 7:25 1 Cor 7:38-40 (...) let him be anathema."

Theological Error No. 19: Mary is fused with the wisdom of God and contains infinite intelligence.

7.9 (...) Mary (...) a heavenly creature merged with the great light and wisdom of God (...) the miracle lies in the fact of containing Infinite Intelligence (...)
Catechesis of August 29, 1944. T1ch12. T1ch7.

Valtorta accumulates bizarre expressions that border on the grotesque. Only God has infinite intelligence; no creature can "contain" God's infinite intelligence. It is not dignified or respectful to the Virgin Mary to write that she is "merged into the wisdom of God." It is not respectful to say anything about the Virgin Mary under the pretext of trying to magnify her.

Theological Error No. 20: The Incarnation is an imprisonment without diminution

1.2 - Jesus said: (...) The Holy Trinity descended [into Mary] with all its perfections, dwelt there with the three Persons, enclosed its infinite Being in such a small space—without diminishing itself, because the love of the Virgin and the will of God expanded that space until it became a Heaven (...) Wednesday, August 16, 1944. T1ch1 T1ch1.
By taking on human nature and becoming incarnate, God did not "enclose himself without diminishing himself." There is a union of God with a human body and a human soul, but not an enclosure without diminution. The term "enclosure" is theologically inaccurate and can lead to a misunderstanding of the divine presence. Divine power transcends all spatial and material limitations. God is omnipresent, and his infinite Being cannot be circumscribed by any space or materi . The idea of an " " (incarnate God) " " (enclosed) " " (without diminution) risks reducing God to a conception that is too human or spatial.

diminution" risks reducing God to an overly human or spatial conception.

Theological Error No. 21: Mary possessed wisdom "before she was born."

Theological Error No. 22: Mary's pre-existence: her heart was beating in Paradise before her birth.

8.7 – Jesus said: (...) Mary (...) wanted (...) to have Wisdom as her mistress. In her humility, she did not know that she possessed it before she was born, and that her union with Wisdom was only a continuation of the divine beating of her heart in Paradise. (...) Catechesis of Wednesday, August 30, 1944. T1ch14. T1ch8.
A beating heart is not an idea in God. Valtorta expresses the idea of a pre-existence before birth, which is a serious doctrinal error.

Indecency No. 3: At the age of twelve, Mary speaks of the "prick of the senses" of her future husband.

God will open my husband's heart to the light... Life will lose the sting of the senses and become a pure flower that exudes the fragrance of charity.
Vision of Saturday, September 2, 1944. T1ch16. T1ch10. A 12-year-old girl, 2,000 years ago, does not talk about such things.

Theological Error No. 23: When the Angels carry the weight of Mary's body, they make more noise with their wings than they did a minute before when they were not carrying the Virgin Mary.

650.2 - Suddenly a great light filled the room, a silvery light (...) in this heavenly light, angelic creatures became visible (...) a dance

of sparks of all colors emanated from their gently moving wings, from which came a kind of harmonious murmur (...) very soft. The angelic creatures form a circle around the little bed (...) lift the motionless body and, flapping their wings more strongly, which increases the sound that existed before, through (...) the roof (...) they fly away, carrying with them the body of their Queen (...) Dec. *8*, 1951. T10ch36. T10ch650.

When reading Maria Valtorta, one sometimes gets the impression that these texts were written by enemies of the Church to ridicule the Christian faith. Here, she ridicules the holy Angels by insinuating that when they carry the body of the Virgin Mary, they have to flap their wings more strongly and thus make more noise. It's grotesque. On the one hand, angels do not have wings; they are purely spiritual creatures. On the other hand, an angel does not have to make any effort when carrying a human body. It is foolish to say otherwise, as it contradicts the Catholic faith regarding angels. Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica,* Prima Pars, Q. 50-64; Serge-Thomas Bonino, o.p., *Les Anges et les Démons (Angels and Demons)*, Paris, Parole et Silence, 2007; Mgr Bernard Bartmann, *Précis de Théologie Dogmatique (Precis of Dogmatic Theology),* Paris, Salvator, Volume 1, Book 2, Section 2, Chapter 1 on Angels, book available for free download at JesusMarie.com

Note No. 1: mediocre style, everything is "small" in the descriptions.

In this case, although the Virgin Mary, perfect in beauty since she is immaculately conceived, should not have been small in stature, her bed is described as "small." It would be interesting to study this occurrence of "small" things in Valtorta's descriptions: small hands, small feet, small face, small mouth, small house, small love, small sparrow, etc. At the end of the book, several

excerpts illustrate this literary mediocrity.

Theological Error No. 24 and Indecency No. 4: The Virgin Mary pronounces the Holy Name of God.

10.6 *(...) I am misery and dust. I dare not lift my eyes to Glory. That is why, more than the double veil behind which I know the invisible Presence of Jehovah lies, I love to look within my heart. (...) Vision of Saturday, September 2, 1944. T1ch16. T1ch10.*

This is one of the errors pointed out by Father Alberto Vaccari in his report for the Holy Office. He describes it as "pure fantasy." Only the high priest pronounced this name, and we do not know how or in what form. Mishnah Sanhedrin 10:1 considers it a grave sin to pronounce the name of God.

It is certain that the Jews of Jesus' time never pronounced the name of God; they did not vocalize the sacred tetragrammaton by Jehovah. This is still the case today. It is an indecency against the Virgin Mary because it accuses her of having sinned gravely against God, since it is strictly forbidden to pronounce His Most Holy Name.

Theological Error No. 25: "Mary remembered God (...) everything her mind had seen in the splendor of God's Heaven at the moment she was created."

10.8 - Jesus said: "Mary remembered God. She dreamed of God. She believed she was dreaming. She was only reviewing everything her mind had seen in the splendor of God's Heaven at the moment she was created to be united with the flesh conceived on earth (...)
Catechesis Sept. 2, 1944. T1ch17. T1ch10.

Mary was created in her mother's womb and not in Paradise. The fact that Valtorta claims that Mary saw something in the splendor of God's Heaven proves that her pre-existence does not consist of an eternal existence in God's mind, since Valtorta's Jesus explains that the eyes of the Virgin Mary that her spirit saw things, but an idea in God does not see things in God since it is an idea, and that the human person will only begin to live at the moment of procreation by his human parents on earth during a conjugal union.

Theological Error No. 26: "The saints remember God and the words heard in the Creative Thought."

10.9 (...) The saints remember God, the words heard in the Creative Thought, which Goodness resurrects in their hearts to lift them up like eagles in the contemplation of the Truth, in the knowledge of Time. (...) Catechesis Sept. 2, 1944. T1ch17. T1ch10.

This error insinuates a kind of pre-existence of the saints in Heaven before their birth on earth. This contradicts Catholic faith.

Theological Error No. 27: Mary remembered hearing the words of eternal Science when she was begotten with her immortal spirit by God.

(...) *[Mary] discovered (...) the words of eternal Science and remembered, like all the saints, having heard them when she was begotten with her immortal spirit by God (...) And if she did not remember everything about her future mission, it was because, in all human perfection, God leaves gaps, due to a divine prudence which is goodness towards his creatures, providing them with opportunities for merit (...)*
Catechesis of September 2, 1944. T1ch17. T. 1ch10.

Theological Error No. 28: Jesus' strength comes from Mary's prayers.

433.5 (...) *"Mother, Mother! Don't talk like that! My strength comes from your prayers. My spirit finds rest in thinking of you, and now, here I am, my Heart finds comfort in remaining like this, with my head against your blessed heart... Mother!"* May 9, 1946. T6ch125. T7ch433.

Let us note, following Father Guillaume Chevallier, the theological impossibility of this statement, because Christ alone merited it; no creature, not even the Virgin Mary, obtained grace for him. As the Second Vatican Council says in its Dogmatic Constitution Lumen Gentium

§60: "60. Mary, handmaid of the Lord: Our Mediator is unique, according to the words of the Apostle: 'For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all' (1 Tim 2:5-6). But Mary's maternal role towards men in no way obscures or diminishes this unique mediation of Christ: on the contrary, it manifests its power. For any salutary influence of the Blessed Virgin on men has its source in a purely gratuitous disposition of God: it does not arise from any objective necessity, but flows from the superabundance of Christ's merits; it is based on his mediation, on which it depends entirely and from which it derives all its virtue; the immediate union of believers with Christ is in no way impeded, but rather favored.

Theological Error No. 29: The Virgin Mary blushed.

11.2 (...) the High Priest said to her: (...) Do you not know any man of your race, Mary, who could be your husband? Mary raised her face, all red with modesty. (...) She replied: "No one." (...)
11.4 - The tears, held back until then, spring forth and flow

to her trembling mouth, and Mary casts a pleading glance at her mistress. (...) "God will give you a husband, a holy husband, since you have entrusted yourself to Him. You will tell him your wish." "Will he accept?" "I hope so. Pray, O daughter, that he may understand your heart. Go now, may God be with you always." (...)
Vision September 3, 1944 T1ch18. T1ch11.

12.6 - The two fiancés are facing each other. Marie, blushing, has her head bowed. Joseph, also a little red-faced, watches her and searches for words to say to her (...)
Vision September 4, 1944. T1ch19. T1ch12.

Valtorta makes errors regarding the privileges associated with the preservation of original sin and its consequences. She demeans Mary by imagining for her the same embarrassment experienced by those who suffer the effects of original sin. Mary did not blush, her lips did not tremble. Adam and Eve before the Fall had perfect control over themselves and over such physiological and psychological phenomena.

Theological Error No. 30 and Indecency No. 5: Jesus was "born" by "a divine seed deposited in" the womb of the Virgin Mary

651.3 (...) [Mary:] my Son, true God and true Man, born not of a carnal will but of divine marriage and a divine seed deposited in my womb. April 18, 1948. T10ch37. T10ch651.

This ridicules and demeans the miracle of the Incarnation, for the Church has never taught that the Incarnation took place by means of a "divine seed." It was accomplished by a miracle which was not the sending of a "divine spermatozoid." The incarnation is not a

Surrogate Motherhood (G.P.A.).

Theological Error No. 31: The perpetual chastity of Saint Joseph repairs the original sin, which was sexual.

Theological Error No. 17 (continued)

13.10 (...) [Saint Joseph] does so, clothed in linen with his body mortified by his vow to abolish the instincts which, one day, at the beginning of time, triumphed, damaging God's rights over man, and that now it will be trampled underfoot in the Son, in the Mother and in the putative father, so that men may return to Grace, and that God's right over man may be restored to Him. He does this with his perpetual chastity. Catechesis, September 5, 1944. T1ch21. T1ch13.

As proof that Maria Valtorta teaches that original sin was lust, she explains that Saint Joseph's chastity was a response to the instincts that triumphed at the beginning of time. The Church teaches that original sin was a sin of pride and disobedience, not a sexual sin. This error was denounced by Father Alberto Vaccari in his Opinion on "The Gospel as Revealed to Me."

Indecency No. 6: The Virgin Mary caresses her mother in her womb.

[Saint Anne:] – *Star, our star. I don't know, but I think, I think it will be a girl. It seems to me that such gentle caresses can only come from a very sweet little girl.*
Vision of August 24, 1944. T1ch5. T1ch4.

Theological Error No. 32: Cain and his children were zoophiles.

Scientific Error No. 1: The monsters born of zoophile couplings from Cain and from his children "astonish your scholars and lead them astray."

Those who were no longer children of God, since, like their father and with him, they had fled from God to welcome Satan, rushed toward what is illicit, degrading, and bestial. And instead of sons and daughters, they had monsters. It is these monsters that astonish your scholars today and lead them astray. With their powerful physique, wild beauty, and bestial ardor, these monsters—the result of the union of Cain and the beasts, of the union of Cain's most beastly children and wild beasts—seduced the children of God, that is, the descendants of Seth (...) Catechesis, Dec. 30, 1946. The Notebooks from 1945 to 1950.

There is no major religious tradition, no canonical text, no serious apocrypha, which accuses Cain, the son of Adam and Eve in Genesis, and his children, of being zoophiles.

Theological Error No. 33: Mary carried Maria Valtorta with her in the secret of her early years.

15.5 (...) Mary said: (...) I carried you with me in the secret of my early years (...) Vision Sept. 16, 1944. T1 ch22. T1 ch15.
Exaggeration that equates Mary's thoughts with those of God, who has carried us within him for all eternity. It is obvious that the Virgin Mary was not thinking of Maria Valtorta, who was going to

born nearly 2,000 years later. This is boasting on Valtorta's part and anticipates, for the Mother of Jesus, the capacity for action that she will receive once in Heaven. As Father Gerard Herrbach, fsspx, says, "she probably had nothing else to think about" (cf. *Des Visions sur l'Évangile,* Fideliter, Eguelshardt, France, 1993, p. 93).

10 Errors of Maria Valtorta on the Annunciation

The Annunciation in *The Gospel as Revealed to Me* by Valtorta:
(...) *16.2 - Mary begins to sing (...) she repeats from time to time: "Jehovah," I guess it must be a sacred song, perhaps a psalm. Mary is probably remembering the songs of the Temple. (…) 16.4 - "Hail Mary, full of grace, hail!" (…) "Do not be afraid, Mary," repeats the archangel. "I am Gabriel, the angel of God. My Lord has sent me to you. Do not be afraid, for you have found favor with God. You will conceive a son in your womb, you will give birth to him and you will name him 'Jesus'. He will be great, he will be called the Son of the Most High (which he will indeed be); the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father, he will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and his reign will have no end. You, the holy Virgin, beloved of the Lord, his blessed daughter, you who are called to be the mother of his Son, understand what Son you will bear. – How can this be, since I do not know man? Does the Lord God no longer accept the offering of his servant, and does he not want me to be a virgin for his sake? – It is not by the action of a man that you will be a mother, Mary. You are the eternal Virgin, the Holy One of God. The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. Therefore, the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God. Nothing is impossible with God, Mary, full of grace. What shall I say to my Lord? Let no thought trouble you. He will watch over your interests if you trust in him. The world, heaven, and the Eternal One await your answer!" In turn, Mary crossed her hands over her chest, bowed deeply, and said, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord. Let it be done to me according to his word."*

The Angel sparkles with joy. He worships, because he surely sees the Spirit of God descending upon the Virgin, prostrate to give her consent (...). Vision of Wednesday, March 8, 1944. T1ch23. T1ch16.

The true account of the Annunciation: Gospel according to St. Luke *1:*

26 In the sixth month, the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a town in Galilee called Nazareth, 27 to a virgin betrothed to a man named Joseph, of the house of David. The virgin's name was Mary. 28 The angel came to her and said, "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with you, you are blessed among women." (29) When Mary saw him, she was troubled by his words and wondered what this greeting might mean. (30) The angel said to her, "Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God. (31)Behold, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall name him Jesus. (32) Hewill be great and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father, andhe will reign over the house of Jacob forever, (33) andhis kingdom will have no end." (34) Mary said to the angel, "How can this be, since I do not know a man?" (35) The angel answered her, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. Therefore, the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God. (36)Even your relative Elizabeth has conceived a son in her old age, and she who was called barren is now in her sixth month, (3 7) for nothing is impossible with God." (3 8) Mary said, "Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord. May it be done to me according to your word." And the angel departed from her.

Theological Error No. 34 and Indecency No. 7: The Virgin Mary committed the sin of pronouncing the name of God

According to Maria Valtorta, she sings "Jehovah," even though this pronunciation never existed among Jews or

among the early Christians. It was totally forbidden to pronounce the name of God. Because of the commandment, "Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain," the tetragrammaton was never pronounced by Jews; this is still the case today, Jews say "the Lord" or "the Name." It would have been a sin for the Virgin Mary to dare to pronounce this name.

The Septuagint Bible, the one Jesus uses when he quotes the Old Testament, never writes "Jehovah" and translates the sacred tetragrammaton YHWH as "the Lord." This is what the Holy See asked Bible translators to do in 2008 in the hope of putting an end to the lamentable abuse of translating it as "Jehovah."

We are therefore faced with a huge error on Valtorta's part, an error that was pointed out by Father Alberto Vaccari, an exegete, who described it as "pure fantasy" because all academics know that this pronunciation of YHWH as "Jehovah" or "Yahweh" never existed among Jews.

Valtorta presents variations in pronunciation that he claims existed among the Jews. This is yet another case of false science that impresses the ignorant, who are far removed from historical, scientific, and religious truth. In France, we say, "to be taken for a ride."

Theological Error No. 35: St. Gabriel repeats "Hail Mary" twice

This distorts the Gospel text without any serious reason. Words spoken clearly and calmly do not need to be repeated.

Theological Error No. 36: St. Gabriel repeats "do not be afraid" three times to the Virgin Mary

This distorts the Gospel and is insulting to Mary, who does not need to be told something three times to understand it. Once again, this is an unwarranted and unnecessary distortion of the Gospel.

Theological Error No. 37: St. Gabriel says to the Virgin: understand what Son you are going to bear

Would the Virgin Mary have difficulty understanding? Does she need to be told repeatedly in order to understand? This is yet another point that distorts the Gospel and demeans and disrespects Mary.

Theological Error No. 38: The Virgin Mary considered the possibility of renouncing her vow of virginity

"Does God no longer accept that I remain a virgin for love of him?" The Church Fathers affirm, on the contrary, that she made her virginity a non-negotiable condition (see *The Golden Chain* of St. Thomas Aquinas on the Gospel according to St. Luke). The Virgin Mary reaffirmed her desire to live her virginity through her words to St. Gabriel. Valtorta demeans the Virgin Mary, making her out to be someone who hypothesizes that God can change his mind on a subject to which she has committed her entire life. Valtorta completely reverses the true thoughts and words of the Virgin: in reality, the Virgin Mary said to Gabriel: "How will this be, since I do not know man?" This vow was carefully considered; it was the result of a very clear and firm request from God to her. Mary knows that God does not change. Especially since God had just given her a husband who shared her desire for

. St. Joseph had also taken a vow of virginity.

Theological Error No. 39: St. Gabriel: "[God] will watch over your interests if you trust him."

God watches over the interests of all, including those who do not trust him. St. Gabriel could never have uttered such nonsense. God is perfectly good to all, always. *In hell, the damned do not accuse God, they accuse themselves*, said the Curé of Ars, St. John Mary Vianney.

Theological Error No. 40: St. Gabriel puts pressure on the Virgin Mary: "The world, heaven, and the Eternal One await your answer!"

How are the world and heaven involved? The choice presented to Mary concerns only God and her. This attempt to pressure the Virgin is vulgar, stupid, and shameful. God respects our freedom with infinite delicacy. For a choice of such gravity, no angel has the right to insist or pressure the Virgin Mary to respond. It's like something out of a boulevard play. (In France, a type of popular, comical, often vulgar theater).

Theological Error No. 41: "Let it be done to me according to HIS word" (Valtorta) or "Let it be done to me according to YOUR word" (Luke 1:38).

Another sign of disrespect for the Word of God: Valtorta seriously distorts the Gospel. Obviously, it is the text of St. Luke that is true, not that of Valtorta. The Virgin did not

not hear the word of God but the word of Saint Gabriel, even though he was sent by God.

Theological Error No. 42: St. Gabriel addresses the Virgin Mary, his Queen, informally.

The difference between "tu" and "vous" does not exist in Aramaic or Hebrew, but it does exist in Italian. The familiar form of address is more informal than the formal form, so if Gabriel had spoken in Italian or French, he would have used the formal form of address with the Virgin Mary. Valtorta chooses the familiar form, which is impossible coming from a holy angel of God addressing Mary, his Queen.

Theological Error No. 43: St. Gabriel ends this conversation with an act of adoration before the Virgin Mary.

Is he a spectator of the Incarnation? What is the meaning of this act of adoration, which does not appear in the Gospel and is not mentioned by any great mystic? Why does Valtorta not explain what Gabriel is adoring? It is another error to imagine this act of adoration before the Virgin Mary.

Maria Valtorta's readers are flattered: they are led to believe that they have access to hidden information that does not appear in the Catholic Gospels, when in fact they are far removed from the commentaries of the Church Fathers, the great mystics, the Catholic saints, and spiritual authors.

* * *

Theological Error No. 44: Jesus invented a philosophical doctrine opposed to Christianity that does not exist: "classicism."

Note No. 2: Jesus probably confuses naturalism with naturism.

Rationalism, humanism, philosophism, theosophism, naturism, classicism, Darwinism—you have schools and doctrines of all kinds, and you make a big deal out of all of them, even though the truth is distorted or suppressed in them. There is only the school of Christianity that you do not want to follow or explore further. Catechesis of August 22, 1943.

In the original Italian language of Maria Valtorta:
Rationalism, Humanism, Philosophism, Theosophy, Naturalism, Classicism, Darwinism, you have schools and doctrines of all kinds, and you make a great show of all of them, even though the truth is greatly distorted or suppressed in them. Only the school of Christianity you do not want to follow or study in depth. https://www.valtortamaria.com/operaminore/quaderno/1/manoscritto/2/22-agosto-1943

CNRTL Dictionary, CLASSICISM, noun. A.− LITERATURE
1. Vx. Characteristic of the works of writers of antiquity.
2. [In France, in the 17th century and more specifically from around 1660 onwards] Doctrine of the supporters of classical literature based essentially on the union of reason, the sense of beauty linked to plausibility, propriety, purity of style, and the choice of subjects generally inspired by antiquity.
− Specifically, THEATER. Characteristic of a play that follows certain rules, such as the rule of three unities.
3. Mod. Aspect of a work presenting the characteristics

of authors of antiquity or of 17th-century France.

B.− B.-A. Classical character of a pictorial, sculptural or musical work (see classic I A 2). The authoritarian and tyrannical classicism of David (L. Réau, L'Art romantique, 1930, p. 216)

C.− P. ext., coll. Character of something that conforms to intellectual or aesthetic tradition (see classic I B).
Naturalism is a philosophical doctrine opposed to Christianity. Naturism opposes Christian modesty and prudence in the context of the struggle to achieve chastity. In the Christian view of the body and sexuality, the body is programmed, designed, and conceived for self-giving; the body is the bearer of a mysterious and profound language, that of self-giving. Naturism denies original sin, lust, and the teaching of modesty. It is a form of anthropological utopia that rejects the reality of sin and its consequences. Naturalism, as a philosophical school, has had a much greater impact than Naturism on the de-Christianization of European society because it is linked to the emergence of rationalism (Spinoza, Diderot, Holbach), scientism (Auguste Comte), materialist criticism of religion, and an atheistic humanism that rejects all transcendence.

Naturalism undermined the metaphysical and moral foundations of Christianity by denying revelation, reducing man to his biological or psychological dimension, and considering the Church as a human and cultural construct among others. Conversely, it cannot be said that naturalism is a major philosophical school of systematic opposition to the Christian faith. It is a secondary social and cultural phenomenon.

Theological Error No. 45: Without original sin, human procreation would have occurred without the sexual act between a man and a woman.

17.4 (...) God said to man and woman: "You know all the laws and mysteries of creation. But do not try to usurp my right to be the Creator of man. My love, which flows within you, will suffice for the propagation of the human race, without lust; the sole movement of charity will bring forth the new Adams of the human race. I give you everything. I reserve for myself only this mystery of the formation of man." March 5, 1944. T1ch24 T1ch17.
This heresy is refuted by St. Thomas Aquinas in the *Summa Theologica*, Prima Pars, Question 98.

(...) Firstborn because he was born first in the line of Adam, as, according to the will of the Father, the sons of man should have been born: by procreation, without sensuality or pain (...) Catechesis of Sunday, January 16, 1944. The Notebooks of 1944.
Italian: *"con procreazione priva di senso e di dolore" is better translated as "procreation without the intervention of the senses and without pain."*
Valtorta also writes: *(...) love had to be born between spouses free from the vice of lust, and give children to chaste marital beds. Being chaste does not mean denying oneself marital union.* Dictation of November 28, 1943, The Notebooks of 1943.
However, if an author writes a serious theological error and contradicts himself in another passage that is in accordance with Catholic faith, this does not erase the doctrinal error, especially if one claims to receive what is written from God, because God cannot contradict himself or teach heresies or theological errors.

Theological Error No. 46: The sequence of events of original sin according to Valtorta: Satan caresses Eve's limbs. Satan arouses in her an excitement she did not have before. She "lives." She wanted to try. It was the awakening of the flesh. She ate the fruit.

Theological Error No. 47: Maria Valtorta mutilates the verse from Genesis (3:6) to change its meaning.

Valtorta: *"The woman saw that the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye... She took some of its fruit and ate it."*

Theological Error No. 17 (continued): The original sin was the conjugal act.

Genesis 3:6: "The woman saw that *the fruit* of the tree was good to eat, pleasing to the eyes, and desirable for gaining wisdom, so she took some of its fruit and ate it..."

Theological Error No. 48: Maria Valtorta writes that Satan provoked in Eve, before she sinned, an excitement that she did not have, but this is not possible because Eve was perfect and therefore had perfect control over all her emotions and sensations.

Maria Valtorta projects onto a perfect Eve the excitement that temptation can cause in a woman who bears the consequences of Original Sin. The process that led Eve to choose pride and disobedience has nothing to do with sensuality or curiosity, as Maria Valtorta tries to explain in the typed version of *The Gospel as Revealed to Me.* Pride and curiosity are two different vices.
17.5 - Satan wanted to take away man's virginity

intellectual; with his viper's tongue, he flattered and caressed Eve's limbs and eyes, provoking in her reflexes and excitement that she had not felt before, when malice had not yet intoxicated them. She "saw." She wanted to try. It was the awakening of the flesh. (...) But Eve does not go to the Father (...) This sensation is sweet to her. "The woman saw that the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eyes... She took some of its fruit and ate it." Then she "understood." From then on, the bite of evil had descended upon her. She saw with new eyes and heard with new ears the customs and voices of brutes. And she desired them with a mad desire (...). March 5, 1944. T1 ch24 T1 ch17.

The Holy Text of the Holy Bible:

Genesis 2. 25 The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame. **Genesis 3.** 1 Now the serpent was the most cunning of all the wild animals the Lord God had made. He said to the woman, "Did God really say, 'You must not eat from any tree in the garden'? (2) The woman said to the serpent, "We may eat fruit from the trees in the garden. (3) But God said, 'You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die. (4) The serpent said to the woman, "You will not surely die. (5) but God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil. (6) When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, pleasing to the eyes, and desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some of its fruit and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it. (7) The eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked; so they sewed fig leaves together and made loincloths for themselves. (8) Then they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden. (9) But the Lord God called to the man and said to him, "*Where are you?*" (10) He

He replied, "*I heard your voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked, so I hid myself*." (11) And the Lord God said, "*Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree that I commanded you not to eat from?" (*12) The man said, "*The woman you put here with me gave me some fruit from the tree, and I ate it.*" (13) The Lord God said to the woman, "*What have you done?"* The woman said, "*The serpent deceived me, and I ate.*" (14) And the Lord God said to the serpent, "*Because you have done this, you are cursed above all livestock and all wild animals. You will crawl on your belly and eat dust all the days of your life.* (15) And *I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and her offspring; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel. (*16) To the woman he said, "I *will greatly multiply your pain in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children, and your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you."* (17) To the man he said, *"Because you listened to your wife and ate from the tree about which I commanded you, 'You shall not eat from it,' cursed is the ground because of you; in pain you shall eat of it all the days of your life. (*18) *It will produce thorns and thistles for you, and you will eat the plants of the field.* (19) *By the sweat of your face you will eat bread until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for dust you are and to dust you will return.*

20 Adam named his wife Eve, because she was the mother of all living things. 21 The Lord God made tunics of skin for Adam and his wife and clothed *them*. 22 Then the Lord God said, *"Now the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil. Now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, to eat and live forever.* (23) And the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. (24) And he drove out the man, and placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubim and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

Genesis 4. [1]Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain and said, "I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord." [(2)]She bore again his brother Abel.

Theological Error No. 49: The Incarnation consisted in the deposit of the "Seed of the Lord" in Mary.

Theological Error No. 50: The blood of the Virgin Mary served as the soil for "the Seed of the Lord."

The Magisterium teaches that the Incarnation took place without human seed. It is probable that the miracle of the conception of Jesus' body and soul did not take place without an ovum from the Virgin Mary, but this is a miracle about which we have no details. Nevertheless, we can affirm that science does not teach us that procreation takes place with blood, but with an ovum. Valtorta falls into the error of Mary of Agreda in *The Mystical City of God,* Volume 2 of the Poussièlgue-Rusand edition, chap. 11, § 137, p. 568: "her most chaste heart was as if squeezed and pressed by a force that caused three drops of her most pure blood to distill into her virginal womb (...) so that the heart of the most pure Mary truly and really provided, by the power of love, the matter from which the most holy humanity of the Word was formed for our redemption."

17.8- Mary said: "When I understood the mission to which God was calling me, I was filled with joy; with joy, my heart opened like a closed lily, and out came the blood that served as fertilizer for the Seed of the Lord (...). Catechesis of Wednesday, March 8, 1944. T1ch25. T1ch17.

Maria Valtorta teaches two errors about the Incarnation, as proven by several documents of the Magisterium of the Catholic Church. It suffices to cite one, the *Profession of Faith Against the Errors of the Priscillianists*: "(...) This Son of

God, therefore, God, born of the Father before all beginnings, was sanctified in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary (the womb of the Virgin Mary), and from her, begotten without the seed of a man (...)" cf. Denzinger No. 189. There was no "seed of the Lord" and the blood of the Virgin Mary did not serve as a seedbed. Why tell nonsense about the Incarnation and deceive readers when theology clearly teaches this magnificent mystery?

Theological Error No. 51: Eve "wanted to lower herself to the level of a lower creature."

17.9 (...) The Spirit of God had instructed me about the Father's sorrow at the corruption of Eve, who, though she was a creature of grace, had wanted to lower herself to the level of a lower creature (...) *How impoverished Eve became by renouncing this wealth! [*In Maria Valtorta's text, we understand that what Eve impoverished herself of was motherhood without sensual pleasure]. Catechesis of Wednesday, March 8, 1944. T1ch25. T1ch17.
Contrary to what Maria Valtorta writes, Eve wanted to be
"like gods, knowing good and evil" (Genesis 3:5), which has nothing to do with the desire to have offspring through sexual union.

Theological Error No. 52: Satan's temptation in the Garden of Eden was: "Do you not know the joy of being two in one flesh, which creates a third and so on?"

Theological Error No. 17 (continued): The original sin was the conjugal act.

17.12- The origin of sin lies in disobedience (…)

She lets herself be led by childish curiosity (...) by recklessness (...) Her presumption is her downfall, this presumption that is already the leaven of pride (...) Do you think you are kings? You are less free than a wild beast. She, at least (...) has the right to be creative like God. She bears children and sees her family grow as she wishes. Not you. This joy is denied you. What is the point of having made you man and woman if it is to live this way? Be gods. Do you not know the joy of being two in one flesh, creating a third and so on? (...) Eve did not have the will to reject it (...) to experience what it was not for man to know (...) Woman becomes female and, with the leaven of satanic knowledge in her heart, she will corrupt Adam. Their flesh thus debased (...) Eve sought pleasure, triumph, freedom (...) Catechesis of Wednesday, March 8, 1944. T1ch25. T1ch17.

According to Valtorta, the original sin was to want to have offspring through the sexual union between Adam and Eve. The text of Genesis says that Eve ate the fruit, but she did so alone. Maria Valtorta contradicts Holy Scripture, according to which Satan's temptation was as follows:

Genesis 3. [1] "(...) He said to the woman, 'Did God say, "You shall not eat of any tree in the garden"? [2] The woman said to the serpent, 'We may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden. [3] But of the fruit of the tree in the middle of the garden, God said, You shall not eat of it, nor shall you touch it, lest you die. ([4]) The serpent said to the woman, "You will not die. ([5]) But God knows that when you eat of it, your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil."
The sacred text does not say that Eve brought the fruit to Adam, and that they ate the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil at the same time. Thus, the text of Genesis itself

contradicts Valtorta's version, because Eve cannot unite with Adam when she is alone, without Adam.

Indecency No. 8: "Eve rolled in the mud and filth."

17.18 (...) I had not forbidden love to men. I simply wanted it to be without malice (...) they were to love each other equally with a holy affection that no lust would defile (...) Eve (...) rolled in the mud and filth, when she could have run happily among the flowers of the Garden of Eden and seen her descendants blossoming around her, like a tree covered with flowers without dragging its leaves through the mud (...) March 8, 1944. T1ch26. T1ch17.

Theological Error No. 53: Mary tells Elizabeth that Jesus is God.

(...) VM: My Jesus! (...) He is God, I am his servant (...) I can be in love with Him, because He is my God and my love as a lover does not conflict with my virginal consecration. (...) Vision April 2, 1944. T1ch34. T1ch22.

The Gospel says that Mary was afraid when Jesus spent three days without her during the episode of the Finding in the Temple, so Maria Valtorta contradicts the Gospel because it makes no sense to be afraid if God spends three days in Jerusalem at the age of 12 without his parents. Similarly, according to Saint Luke, when Mary finds Jesus in the Temple, she asks him for an explanation, which Mary would never have done if she had already received the revelation that her child was true God and true man. The question of when the Virgin understood the divine nature of her son is debated. It seems to us that this revelation was made to her by Jesus after his

resurrection, at his first appearance, which was probably to his mother. At the Annunciation, she understood that she was going to be the mother of the Messiah awaited by all Israel, the Christ.

Theological Error #54: Satan believes that God can sin because during Jesus' temptation in the desert, Satan said, "I remember that you are my God."

46.6 (...) I want to serve you because you are good and I always remember that you are my God, even though I have now become unworthy of that name. Help me with your prayers so that I may... "

"Be silent. Man does not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from God." Feb. 24, 1944. T2ch5. T1ch46, 1985 edition.

The fact that Satan tempts Jesus proves that Maria Valtorta's text is false because Satan knows that God cannot sin, God is unbeatable, so the Devil cannot "tempt" God. Satan is imprisoned in hell by divine decision. Satan has no desire for all of hell to mock him. Everyone in hell knows that God is invincible: they are tortured in hell in fire precisely because they tried to fight God. Satan did not know, during the temptation in the desert, that Jesus is God. The demons knew that Jesus is the Christ, the expected Messiah, but they did not know that Jesus is God made man. Chapter 1 of the Book of Job shows how limited Satan is by God in all his actions.

On the question of whether Jesus could sin, the dogmatic teaching of the Roman Catholic Church affirms that Jesus could not sin. Catholic Christology teaches that Jesus could not sin. Jesus' human will is so united with his divine will that he could not sin. This is the impeccability of

Jesus.

Bernard Bartmann's *Summary of Dogmatic Theology*, Book 3: "It is a truth intimately connected with dogma that Jesus was not only factually free from sin, but also incapable of sinning. As a result of his miraculous conception and hypostatic union, he was not subject to the law of original sin and concupiscence. Thus, he was not subject to internal temptation. The temptation recounted in Scripture was a molestation by Satan, as Scripture itself acknowledges (Matt. 4:1-11). Christ could only have sinned through a completely free opposition of his will to the divine will. But this was not possible, because the possessor of the human will was the Logos; consequently, God himself would have abandoned God, which would be absurd.

In addition to this decisive reason, the fullness of Christ's grace and especially the "beatific vision" are also brought forward as arguments. Sin, not only in itself, but even in its distant conditions and dangers, is the only thing that could oppose the hypostatic union; it must therefore be radically and in principle excluded.

One objection claims that impeccability (not being able to sin) is no longer compatible with freedom. Theologians respond by asserting that the freedom to sin is a defect and not a perfection. Otherwise, angels and God himself would not be truly free, since they cannot sin. But it is insisted that angels, because of their union with God and with the good, are incapable of merit; therefore, Christ must have lived in a spiritual state in which he could merit, for his merit is the essential prerequisite for our redemption. We can only respond that

two things are true and attested to by Scripture: Christ was impeccable and at the same time he was free and freely and meritoriously fulfilled God's precepts, but we do not know in a clear way how these two truths are psychologically reconcilable in Christ. We can only say: Christ could not fail to fulfill his Father's commandment, nor did he want to."

Sixth Ecumenical Council (quoted by Saint Thomas Aquinas: "(Const. 3, gen. 6, act. 18): We proclaim that there are two natural wills in Christ, which are not contrary, as heretics impiously assert; but the human will follows without resistance and without struggle, or rather with submission, the divine and almighty will.

The Commentary on the Sentences of St. Thomas Aquinas: "(...) regarding Letter to the Hebrews 2:9: We see Jesus, who has become a little lower than an angel... crowned with glory and honor, the Glossa says: "For God alone is greater than the nature of the human spirit which God assumed and which could in no way be deformed by sin." Now, the spirit of all those who can sin can be deformed by sin. Christ therefore could not sin.

[2] The perfection of the glorified nature is such that it cannot sin. Now, Christ was a true comprehensor [Jesus had the beatific vision] from the moment of his conception. He therefore could not sin.

[3] Everything that this man did, we can say that God did. If, therefore, this man had sinned, it would follow that God had sinned, which is impossible. Therefore, the conclusion is the same as the first.

Answer. To put it simply, Christ could not

sin in any way. Also, [John] Damascene says in Book III that the Lord Jesus could not sin. Indeed, he can be considered as a viator or as a comprehensor, and as God [comprehensor, which has no equivalent in French , could be translated as "blessed." Indeed, comprehensor(es) is a technical term referring to those who already see God according to his essence, "embrace" him, "enclose" him " " or le "understand" in eternal bliss. On the other hand, we use the term viator(es) to refer to the condition of those who are on the way (in via) to bliss in the present life. See III, q. 15, a. 10, c: Aliquis dicitur viator ex eo quod tendit in beatitudinem, comprehensor autem dicitur ex hoc quod jam beatitudinem obtinet.]. As a viator, he presents himself as the leader who guides us on the right path. Now, in every kind of order, it is necessary that the one who first imposes a rule should not be deviated from, for otherwise there would be error in all those who are governed by him. Thus, Christ himself had such fullness of glory that, even while still on his journey, he could not sin. Thus, those who were close to him were also strengthened, like the apostles who, while still on their journey, could not sin mortally, although they could sin venially. But as comprehensor, the mind [of Christ] was entirely united to the end, so that it could act only according to the order of the end, as has been said of the steadfast angels in Book II, d. 7. But, insofar as [Christ] was God, his body and soul were, so to speak, an instrument of the divinity, insofar as the divinity directed the soul, and the soul directed the body, as [John] Damascene says; therefore, sin could not occur, just as God cannot sin. However, we can concede conditionally that he could have sinned, namely, if he had wanted to, although this antecedent is impossible, for the truth of a conditional statement requires neither the truth of an antecedent nor that of a consequent, but a necessary relationship between

the two.

Indecency No. 9: Mary tells St. Joseph that her humility is perfect.

Theological Error No. 55: Mary says that she "deserved to conceive the One who was awaited."

Theological Error No. 56: Mary affirms that she "conceived" Jesus.

26.4 (...) *"If my humility had not been perfect, I would not have deserved to conceive the One who was expected*. Vision of Wednesday, May 31, 1944. T1ch42. T1ch26.
No saint was more humble than the Virgin Mary, but no humble saint ever said he was humble. It is therefore completely impossible that the Virgin Mary would tell St. Joseph that her humility was "perfect." To write such a thing is to ridicule the Virgin Mary, to make her out to be boastful, to blaspheme her, and to disrespect her. Furthermore, it is wrong to say that Mary deserved the Incarnation. The Incarnation is an undeserved gift. Mary did not
"deserved" to be chosen to be the mother of the Savior, of Christ; it is a pure grace given by God. Mary cooperated magnificently in this immense grace, but she did not "deserve" it. Finally, Mary did not conceive the child Jesus, but she benefited from a miracle of which she was not the author.

Theological Error No. 57: "Speak, Joseph, what do you want?" "Your forgiveness."

26.3 (...) "Speak, Joseph, what do you want?" "Your forgiveness." (...) "My forgiveness? I have nothing to forgive you for,

Joseph. (...) "Forgive me, Mary. I lacked trust. (...) I have lacked charity. I have accused you in my heart. I have accused you unjustly, since I did not ask you to tell me the truth. I have failed God's law by not loving you as I would have loved myself..." (...) "I have nothing to forgive you for. But rather I ask your forgiveness for the pain I have caused you." (...) "Oh, yes, what pain it was! What pain! (...) I was told that I had white hair (...) and wrinkles on my face (...). Vision of Wednesday, May 31, 1944. T1ch42. T1ch26.

Maria Valtorta humbles Saint Joseph by making him say that he believed he had sinned against Mary, which contradicts the words of the holy Angel in his dream.

Gospel according to Saint Matthew 1,
18 Now the birth of Jesus Christ took place in this way. When Mary, his mother, was betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child from the Holy Spirit. 19 Joseph, her husband, being a just man and unwilling to put her to shame, resolved to divorce her quietly.
20 But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, "Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary as your wife, for the child conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. 21She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins." (22) All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: (23) "The virgin will conceive and give birth to a son, and they will call him Emmanuel," which means "God with us." (24) When Joseph woke from sleep, he did as the angel of the Lord had commanded him and took his wife Mary with him. (25) But he did not know her until she had given birth to her firstborn son, and he named him Jesus.

The outstanding holiness of Saint Joseph was manifested precisely in his refusal to judge Mary guilty. Saint

Joseph could have thought that Mary had been raped during her stay with her cousin, which would have been the cause of her pregnancy through no fault of her own.

Theological Error No. 17 (continued): one of the branches of Eve's sin is lust.

29.7 (...) Eve's sin was like a tree with four branches: pride, greed, gluttony, and lust. Catechesis of Tuesday, June 6, 1944. T1ch48. T1ch29.

Here, Maria Valtorta adds pride, greed, and gluttony, but the heart of her argument is to teach that Adam and Eve committed the original sin by uniting sexually, which was forbidden by God. Refer to the opinion of Father Alberto Vaccari for the Holy Office, who explains how this assertion is contradicted by the very text of Genesis. Perhaps realizing that she had made a serious doctrinal error, Maria Valtorta constantly tried to correct her mistake, notably by adding and supplementing the typewritten version, which allowed her to hide the deletions that these changes entailed on the manuscript pages. Variations in doctrine are one of the signs of false apparitions.

Theological Error No. 58 (+ No. 17) and Indecency No. 10: Eve's lust: "It was not enough for her to satisfy herself alone."

29.11 [Mary:] *I have overcome lust, which is gluttony carried to excess (...) Eve's gluttony, already reprehensible, led her to lust. It was not enough for her to satisfy herself alone; she wanted to push her sin to the point of refinement. She experienced lust and taught it to her companion (...) Catechesis, June 6, 1944. T1 ch48. T1 ch*

29

Let us recall that Father Alberto Vaccari, SJ, exegete, in his Opinion for the Holy Office, criticizes the frequent shifts to sexual subjects, finding that the vice of lust is mentioned too often and in too crude a manner.

Theological Error No. 59 and Anti-Semitism No. 1: Jesus says that the will of the Jewish people "is not good."

41.7 (...) the will of this people is not good, and they will not have peace. They will not recognize their King, the Just One, the Savior, because they are waiting for a king clothed in power (...) This people will not love him, because Christ will preach what is not pleasing to this people. Friday, January 28, 1944. T1ch68. T1ch41.

Valtorta renews the anti-Semitic accusation that the Jewish people as a whole were of ill will, when in fact only the majority of their leaders were responsible for the murder of Jesus. To assert that the Jewish people as a whole were ill-disposed contradicts No. 4 of the declaration " *Nostra" Aetate* (cf. Concile Vatican II):

“According to the testimony of Holy Scripture, Jerusalem did not recognize the time when it was visited [Luke 19:44]; the Jews, for the most part, did not accept the Gospel, and many even opposed its spread [Romans 11:28]. (…) Although the Jewish authorities, with their followers, pushed for the death of Christ [John 19:6], what was committed during his Passion cannot be attributed indiscriminately to all Jews living at that time, nor to Jews of our time. If it is true that the Church is *the new People of God*, the Jews should not be presented as rejected by God or cursed, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures (...)."

Theological Error No. 60: Jesus asked the holy women of Jerusalem to "pray for me."

This is impossible because Jesus, as a man, deserved it alone, and as God, Jesus is the author and creator of grace; no one can merit the slightest grace from him. Moreover, in the Gospel, in Gethsemane, Jesus asks the apostles to pray with him, not for him.

Theological Error No. 61: Valtorta distorts the Gospel by omitting verses 30 and 31:

Luke 23[:27]*Now there followed a great multitude of people, including women who were mourning and lamenting him.* [28]*Turning to them, Jesus said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children,* [29]*for behold, the days are coming when they will say, 'Blessed are the barren and the wombs that never bore and the breasts that never nursed. (30) Then they will begin to say to the mountains, 'Fall on us,' and to the hills, 'Cover us. (31) For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when the wood is dry*
dry?"

Theological Error No. 62: Valtorta changes the meaning of this passage because, according to her, Jesus warned the women alive during the Passion of future trials that would befall them, whereas the verses in the Gospels are a prophecy of the sufferings that would be endured during the siege of Jerusalem and its destruction by the Romans in the year 70.

608.9 *(...) do not weep... over Me... daughters of... Jerusalem... but over your sins... (...) mothers... weep over... your sons (...) truly, I say to you... that blessed is he who... falls... under the rubble... (…) Go... home... pray... for Me (…) Jesus sets off again. Vision of*

Monday, March 26, 1945. T9ch28. T10ch608.

Theological Error No. 63: Valtorta omits the darkness reported in the Gospels. Matthew 27:45 "From the sixth hour until the ninth hour, darkness came over the whole land."

609.8 – *Longinus (...) to see better, he shields his eyes with his hand because the sun must be bothering him. It is in fact a strange sun, a fiery red-yellow. Then it seems that the fire suddenly goes out because of a cloud as black as pitch that rises from behind the Jewish chains and quickly crosses the sky and disappears behind other mountains. And when the sun returns, it is so bright that the eye can hardly bear it.*
609.15 – *The sky grows ever darker. Now the clouds barely open to let the sun through. But they pile up in increasingly dark, white, greenish layers (...) The light, at first excessively bright, is turning greenish. (...) The soldiers (...) seem enveloped in a greenish light and under an ashen sky (...) The women look like statues of bluish snow because of their bloodless pallor, which is accentuated by the light.* Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Theological Error No. 64: Jesus does not know the day of the end of the world.

596.47 (...) Likewise, when you see all these things, know that Christ is coming (...) As for the day and the hour, no one knows, not even the angels of the Lord, but the Father alone knows. Vision April 2, 1947. T9ch15. T9ch596.

The text "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" is a

disto r t i o n of this verse: Matthew 24:36: "But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father."

One of my Valtortist friends prefers to believe Maria Valtorta rather than what the Catholic Church teaches, namely that Jesus knew the day of judgment because of his divinity. Constitution *Inter innumeras sollicitudines* on the "Three Chapters," to Emperor Justinian, May 14, 553. Condemnation of the errors of Nestorianism concerning the humanity of Christ.

Denzinger No. 419: "If anyone says that the one Jesus Christ, true Son of God and true Son of man, was ignorant of the future or of the day of judgment, and that he could not know anything except what the divinity dwelling in him as in another revealed to him, let him be anathema. "The Gospel as it was revealed to me" is wrong because it does not give the Catholic doctrine explaining this verse of the Gospel. It is one of those on which the Arians stumble, believing they see in it proof that Jesus was only a man. Our Muslim brothers also quote this verse to support their belief that Jesus is not God. This is why it is particularly serious for Maria Valtorta not to have given the Catholic teaching to explain it. The Valtortists stick to the literal meaning and thus materially profess the Nestorian heresy that Jesus did not know the date of the end of the world. In "Farewell to the Work" on February 3, 1947, Jesus claims that he gave "the Gospel as it was revealed to me" in order to:

"1. Fighting errors. 'The deepest reason for giving this work is (...) [that] the Holy Church (...) may have more resources to fight those who deny (...) the divinity of Christ (...) my unlimited knowledge because it is divine and perfect (...)'. In the present case, we see that

"The Gospel as it was revealed to me" leaves out one of the important verses used by those who fight against the divinity of Christ without explaining it with the data of the Catholic magisterium.

Quotes from St. Thomas Aquinas' *Golden Chain* on this verse:

St. Jerome: We have therefore proved that the Son of Man knows the day of the end of the world; it remains for us to explain why he declares that he does not know it. When, after his resurrection, his Apostles ask him when that day will come, he answers them clearly (Acts 1): "It is not for you to know the times or seasons that the Father has set by his own authority," clear proof that he knows this day, but that it is not useful for the Apostles to have this knowledge. — St. Augustine (On the Trinity, 1, 12.) The expression "he does not know" therefore means "he does not want to let it be known"; this is how the angel spoke to Abraham:
"Now I know that you fear the Lord (Genesis 22), that is, I make it known to you; for this trial made him know himself what he was. — St. Augustine (Sermon 21 on the words of the Lord) He says that the Father knows this day, that is, at the same time that the Son knows it in the Father; for what can there be in this day that was not made in the Word by whom this day was made? — St. Augustine (Book of 83 Questions, question 60.) The true meaning of these words, "The Father alone knows this day," is therefore that which we have indicated, that is, that he makes this day known to the Son; and if it is said of the Son that he does not know, it is because he does not communicate this knowledge to men.

Theological Error No. 65: The Catholic Church has misinterpreted the words of Jesus Christ.

Theological Error No. 66: The Church "believes itself to be superior to everything and everyone."

The Eternal Father says: (...) The Church of My Christ has misinterpreted the words of its Divine Founder (...) It believes itself to be superior to everything and everyone (...) Dictated by God the Father on December 23, 1948, at 11 a.m., The Notebooks of Maria Valtorta.

God the Father accuses the Church: "The Church of My Christ has misinterpreted the words of its Divine Founder." What is God the Father referring to? What are the misinterpretations committed by the Catholic Church regarding the words of Jesus? This serious accusation contradicts the dogma of the infallibility of the Church in carrying out the mission for which it was created by God Himself on the day of Pentecost.

How are we to understand the words "She thinks herself superior to everything and everyone"? Who is superior to the Catholic Church except God? To whom is God the Father referring? Was it not God who founded the Catholic Church and who has kept it alive day after day since its foundation at Pentecost? Didn't Jesus say, " He who hears you hears me" (Luke 10:16)? And "I am with you always, even to the end of the age" (Matthew 28:20)?

Is it a sin to believe that the Catholic Church is superior to everything and everyone because it is divine, perpetual, infallible, perfectly holy, even though it is made up of sinners? Is it not the light of the world? Who is above the Church? Who brings more light than it does?

This sentence implies that the Catholic Church is not superior to everything and everyone, whereas the documents of the Magisterium of the Catholic Church teach:

"The Church is by its nature and by its legal constitution a perfect society 'because it possesses all the means necessary for the attainment of its end'" (Denzinger No. 2919, 3167, 3171, 3685).

"This is why it is, in its order, the most eminent community Denzinger No. 3167 s, 3171, 3685; it is not inferior to civil power Denzinger No. 3167; it is one of the two highest powers by which the world is governed Denzinger No. 347, 362, 767, 873; cf. Thematic Index of Heinrich Denzinger's work, *Symbols and Definitions of the Catholic Faith,* Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1st edition 1996. Could the Maria Valtorta Foundation explain to us to whom and to what the Catholic Church is inferior? Do our beloved Valtortist brothers and sisters profess about the Church that "The virtue of the risen Lord is his strength to enable him to overcome (...) the afflictions and difficulties that come to him both from outside and from within (...)"? Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium,* No. 8.

Do they profess, in accordance with the same Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, No. 4, that:

-the Holy Spirit sanctifies the Catholic Church permanently?
- "The Spirit dwells in the Church (...) as in a temple (cf. 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19)"?
-The Holy Spirit guides the Catholic Church into all truth (cf. Jn 16:13)?
-The Holy Spirit "continually renews" it?

Do they profess, in accordance with the Declaration *Mysterium Ecclesiae on Catholic Doctrine Concerning the Church en vue de la protéger contre les erreurs*

today, from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, dated June 24, 1973, that:

- "There is one Church 'which our Savior, after his resurrection, entrusted to Peter to shepherd (cf. Jn 21:27) (...) which he finally established as the pillar and foundation of truth forever (cf. 1 Tim 3:15)."

- "through the one... Catholic Church of Christ (...) we have access to the fullness of the means of salvation (Vatican II: Decree on Ecumenism Unitatis redintegratio, No. 3)"

- "This Catholic Church is 'rich in all the truth revealed by God and in all the means of grace' with which Christ wished to enrich his messianic community."

- "These same Catholics must confess that, through the effect of divine mercy, they belong to the Church which Christ founded and which is governed by the successors of Peter and the other apostles, in whose hands the institutions and doctrine of the early apostolic community remain intact and alive, a heritage of truth and holiness that will endure forever in their Church (cf. Paul VI, Encyclical Ecclesiam suam).

- "God himself, who is absolutely infallible, has therefore deigned to communicate to his new People, which is the Church, a certain shared infallibility. This infallibility extends only to questions of faith and morals; it is effective when the entire People of God firmly holds a point of doctrine belonging to these questions; it is finally in continuous dependence on the wise Providence and the anointing of grace of the Holy Spirit who guides the Church towards the fullness of truth until the glorious coming of its Lord (Vatican Council II: Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation Dei verbum, No. 7).

The Second Vatican Council declares on this infallibility: "The universal body of the faithful, having the anointing that comes from the Holy One (cf. 1 Jn 2:20 and 27), cannot err in matters of faith, and this special gift it possesses, it manifests through the supernatural sense of faith which is that of the entire people, when 'from the bishops to the most humble lay faithful' (cf. St. Augustine, De Praed. ST., 14, 27), expresses its unanimous consent in matters of faith and morals (Vatican Council II: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium,* No. 12)."

- "By divine institution, it belongs to the pastors alone, successors of Peter and the other apostles, to teach the faithful in an "authentic" way, that is, by virtue of the authority of Christ shared in various ways. Thus, it does not belong to women or men who have visions and dictations to teach the pope and the bishops.

- "The Magisterium of the bishops is, for believers, the sign and the way to receive and recognize the Word of God (Paul VI, Apostolic Exhortation *Quinque iam anni*)."

-“Jesus Christ wanted the Magisterium of the pastors to whom he entrusted the task of teaching the Gospel to all his people and to the entire human family to be endowed with an appropriate charism of infallibility in matters of faith and morals. (...) In the exercise of their office, pastors are assisted by the Holy Spirit, who reaches his summit when they teach the People of God, in such a way that, by virtue of the promises made by Christ to Peter and the other apostles, they propose a doctrine that is necessarily free from error. This is the case when bishops scattered throughout the world, but teaching in communion with the successor of Peter, agree to

present a point of doctrine as requiring irrevocable assent (cf. Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, No. 25).

The same is true, and even more clearly, when the bishops, by a collegial act—as in ecumenical councils—define with their visible head the doctrine that must be held (cf. ibid., No. 25 and No. 22), or when the Roman Pontiff speaks ex cathedra, that is, when, in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, he defines, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, the doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the whole Church (First Vatican Council: Dogmatic Constitution *Pastor aeternus,* chap. 4. Cf. Vatican Council II: ibid., No. 25).

According to Catholic doctrine, the infallibility of the Magisterium of the Church extends not only to the deposit of faith, but also to the truths without which this deposit cannot be properly preserved and expounded (cf. Vatican Council II: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium*, No. 25).

As for the extension of this infallibility to the deposit of faith itself, this is a truth which the Church has recognized from the beginning as revealed to her in the promises made by Christ. Based on this truth, the First Vatican Council defined the scope of Catholic faith:

"All those things which have been proposed to our faith by the whole Church, either through the solemn judgment of the Church, or by the universal teaching authority of the Church, and have been expressed in any way, whether in the sacred books, or in the tradition of the Church, or in the teaching of the Church, or in the experience of the Church, or in the personal authority of the Apostolic Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in the Council Fathers, or in *Dei Filius,* chap. 3; cf. Code of Canon Law, canon 1323, § 1 and 1325, § 2)."

These objects of Catholic faith, which are called

dogmas, are necessarily and have always been an immutable norm for both faith and theological knowledge.

Seehttps://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ cfaith/documents/ rc_con_cfaith_doc_19730705_mysterium-ecclesiae_fr.html

Theological Error No. 67 and Anti-Semitism No. 2: The stupid pride of the chosen people.

Theological Error No. 68 and Anti-Semitism No. 3: The Jewish people wanted the error that led to their extermination.

Theological Error No. 69, Scientific Error No. 2, Anti-Semitism No. 4: God the Father is unaware that: 1) the State of Israel was founded; 2) the Jewish people can once again gather there; 3) this brings an end to their dispersion.

Theological Error No. 70 and Anti-Semitism No. 5: The Jewish people wanted to make the mistake of not believing in Jesus, and they are collectively responsible for this mistake.

(...) the scribes of old (...) presumed to interpret God's prophecies and promises in a way that suited their foolish pride as the chosen people (...) This error caused their downfall and led to their extermination, dispersion, and persecution. And for twenty centuries now, it has been atoning for the mistake it chose to make. Dictated by God the Father on December 23, 1948, at 11 a.m., The Notebooks of Maria Valtorta.

No. 1 It is anti-Semitic to write that "the Jewish people" display stupid pride.

No. 2 It is particularly odious to write that the Jewish people are responsible for the Holocaust because of a mistake they wanted to make. It is clear from the Gospels that all the Jewish people loved Jesus and welcomed him. It was the leaders who rejected Jesus because he did not fit into their plan for military and political overthrow of the Romans.

No. 3 The Second Vatican Council's declaration *Nostra Aetate* teaches that the rejection of Jesus by the Jews was the result of the decision of the vast majority of their leaders, but not of the entire people. See Matthew 27:20: *"But the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowd to ask for Barabbas and to have Jesus put to death.*" Declaration *Nostra Aetate*

No. 4 (cf. Second Vatican Council): "(...) According to the testimony of Sacred Scripture, Jerusalem did not recognize the time when it was visited [Luke 19:44]; the Jews, for the most part, did not accept the Gospel, and many even opposed its spread [Romans 11:28]. (...) Although the Jewish authorities, with their followers, pushed for the death of Christ [John 19:6], what was committed during his Passion cannot be attributed indiscriminately to all Jews living at that time, nor to Jews of our time. If it is true that the Church is *the new People of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected by God or cursed, as if this followed from Sacred Scripture (...)."*

To write that the Jewish people have been atoning for twenty centuries

"for the error they themselves chose to commit" is anti-Semitic and contradicts Catholic doctrine.

No. 5 We can also note the error of God the Father, who refers to twenty centuries of "dispersion," when this came to an end with the founding of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948. God the Father expresses himself as if he were not at

current, perhaps because Maria Valtorta herself did not understand, at the time, the significance of the founding of Israel. It is not God the Father who is ignorant, but Maria Valtorta who thus demonstrates her error.

Theological Error No. 71: The infallibility of the Church is conditional on its holiness.

(…) Hell will not prevail, provided that the Church is holy (...) Hell prevails to a greater or lesser extent, depending on whether the Church loses its holiness, which diminishes God's help (...) Dictation from God the Father, December 23, 1948, at 11 a.m., The Notebooks of Maria Valtorta.

See what is said above about the infallibility of the Church. It is entirely false to write that infallibility is conditional. Hell will never prevail against the Holy Church, whatever the vices of the popes and bishops. This error is reminiscent of the Donatist heresy, which made the validity of the sacraments dependent on the holiness of the priests. Valtorta weakens the authority of the Church's magisterium by subjecting infallibility to a subjective moral condition: holiness.

Theological Error No. 72 and Indecency No. 11: Pope Pius XII will be damned if he does not recognize the apparitions of Maria Valtorta

Theological Error No. 73: God's extraordinary gift to the pontificate of Pius XII is not the victory over Nazism or the promulgation of the Dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, but "The Gospel as it was revealed to me."

(...) I am addressing you directly, you the Vicar of

my Christ and my servant (...) As you serve me in all holiness and love, my word is united with yours so that it may be God who speaks through your mouth as Supreme Pontiff (...) do not displease your Lord who has chosen to mark your pontificate with an extraordinary gift: a new proclamation of the Gospel which confirms the old one (...) if you reject it [the intermediary: Maria Valtorta], it is not so much (...) against him [the intermediary: Maria Valtorta] (...) that you sin: it is me you hurt (...) you sin against Love (...) if you resist my will of love, you are repeating the actions of the princes of the high priests, the Sanhedrin, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the scribes (...) who persecuted and condemned him even before the time appointed for his martyrdom (...) Act in such a way that God may be favorable to you. You can do it. You are the Holy Father, you have no excuse for not doing so. Do not imitate Pilate, or you will suffer the same fate as him (...) Do not misunderstand the One who speaks to you in the Work. You will be judged for it (...) Do not despise this warning (...) Dictation from God the Father, December 23, 1948, at 11 a.m., The Notebooks of Maria Valtorta.

In which apparition recognized by the Catholic Church was the pope threatened with eternal damnation if he did not recognize it? The threats of being judged or suffering the same fate as Pilate amount to threatening a pope who will proclaim the dogma of the Assumption two years later (if it is God the Father who is speaking, he is supposed to know this) with hell. This is completely unacceptable and indecent. Let us remember that according to Catholic doctrine, private revelations, apparitions, and visions are only matters of human faith, meaning that no Catholic is obliged to believe in them, even in the case of recognized apparitions. It is therefore impossible for a pope to be damned because he refuses to approve a woman who claims to have visions.

It should be noted that this Letter from God the Father contradicts the Valtortists' version, which claims that

Pope Pius XII was favorable to the work and said that it could be published: "whoever reads it will understand," which the Valtortists call "the verbal imprimatur." The audience with Pope Pius XII took place on February 26, 1948. This false letter from God the Father has the merit of proving that the pope never said to Father Berti, "whoever reads it will understand." According to Bishop Pepe, the pope simply told the Servites of Mary that if they wanted to publish the work, they had to find a bishop to grant the imprimatur.

History remembers Pope Pius XII as the pope who promulgated the dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (November[1], 1950) and as the one about whom Golda Meir, Israel's foreign minister, said in October 1958, upon his death:

> "During the ten years of Nazi terror, when our people suffered a terrible martyrdom, the voice of the Pope rose to condemn the executioners and express his compassion for the victims."

This tribute, paid by one of the founding fathers of the Jewish state, crowned countless statements made in a similar vein since the Second World War.

In 1945, "on behalf of the entire Jewish community," the World Jewish Congress expressed "its deep gratitude for the protective hand extended by His Holiness to the Jews persecuted during these terribly trying times."

That same year, during an audience with Pius XII, Moshe Sharett, future Prime Minister of Israel, told him that

"his first duty was to thank him and, through him,

the Catholic Church, on behalf of the Jewish community, for all they had done to rescue the Jews."

On May 26, 1955, an orchestra composed of Jewish musicians from fourteen countries performed Beethoven's Ninth Symphony in the Vatican "in recognition of the great humanitarian work accomplished by His Holiness in saving a large number of Jews during World War II" (this text is from jeansevillia.com).

The same Jean Sévilla, author of *Les Habits neufs du terrorisme intellectuel* (The New Clothes of Intellectual Terrorism), Paris, Perrin, Jan. 2025, recommends reading *Pie XII et les juifs, le Mythe du pape d'Hitler (Pius XII and the Jews: The Myth of Hitler's Pope)* by Rabbi David Gil Dalin, Paris, Artège Editions, 2007.

As we prove with official documents from the Holy Office file, Pius XII condemned Maria Valtorta's writings because of the doctrinal errors they contain. These theological errors are the reason why neither St. Paul VI, nor St. John Paul II, nor Benedict XVI took any action to rehabilitate Maria Valtorta or her writings, even though their position at the summit of the Church offered them a whole range of possible actions to that end. Pope Francis recognizes only a "literary work."

An edition approved by the Church would be necessary, expurgated of errors and indecencies. This colossal and delicate task would be useful.

Theological error No. 74: We deserved Jesus' sacrifice.

603.8 (...) the angel of my sorrow presented to me the hope of all those who are saved by my sacrifice as a remedy for my death. Your names! Each one was for Me a drop of medicine infused into my veins (...) Oh, my blessed ones! Comfort of the dying Christ! (...) O you who deserve the Sacrifice of a God. Dictation of Tuesday, February 15, 1944. T9ch4 and 5. T10ch603..

The Sacrifice of Jesus is a merciful gift, a gift and not a due, something we would have deserved through our good deeds. Letter to the Ephesians 2 [8] For by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God, ([9]) not by works, lest anyone should boast. Letter to the Romans, 6 ([23]) For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord. The Word became flesh because he loves us, not because of our merits.

Theological Error No. 75: Jesus told everyone that he was the Christ.

Valtorta destroys what exegesis calls "The Messianic Secret." Thus, in Mark 8:29-30, after Peter confessed that Jesus is the Christ (the Messiah), Jesus "strictly ordered them not to tell anyone about him." This imposed silence emphasizes that Jesus wants to control the revelation of the fact that he is the Christ-Messiah, so that it may be understood in the light of his Passion, death, and Resurrection. He wanted to avoid being received as an earthly king, a military liberator from Roman occupation.

Jesus, out of pedagogical considerations, adapted himself to the difficulty of the Jews of his time in understanding his true divine mission. Through his Passion and death, he revealed that the Messiah is the *Suffering Servant* of chapter 53 of the book of Isaiah, that he came to save through his cross and not through earthly power (cf. *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, translation: *Le Secret Messianique dans les Évangiles,* 1901, by the Protestant exegete Wilhelm Wrede (1859-1906)).

This theme is particularly present in the Gospel according to St. Mark, where Jesus forbids his disciples, demons, and those he heals from revealing that he is the Messiah. For example, after healing a leper, Jesus commands him, "See that you say nothing to anyone" (Mark 1:44). After Saint Peter's confession recognizing Jesus as the Christ: "Then he ordered them not to tell anyone about him" (Mark 8:30). After the Transfiguration: "He ordered them not to tell anyone what they had seen
" (Mark 9:9). During exorcisms: "He did not allow the demons to speak, because they knew him" (Mark 1:34).

On the other hand, just after his death and the miracles that accompanied it, the Roman centurion proclaimed: "Truly, this man was the Son of God!" (Mark 15:39).

Maria Valtorta completely tramples on this dimension of the Gospels, which proves that the Jesus she claims to see is not the real Jesus but her own mediumship and/or a fallen spirit (we do not decide this question), because Jesus cannot reveal a gospel that destroys this element so fundamental to the true Gospels.

Indecency No. 12: Valtorta shows disrespect toward Jesus by writing, "as if he were already experiencing a slight delirium."

Jesus maintained perfect control of himself despite unimaginable suffering.

Theological Error No. 76 and Indecency No. 13: As he dies, Jesus thinks more of his mother than of his heavenly Father.

While the Gospels present Jesus as someone who, even in the depths of suffering, remains turned toward his Father with great nobility of soul, Valtorta makes him a man who, in the depths of distress, calls out to his mother. This ridicules Jesus; it is blasphemous.

These are Jesus' last words according to Maria Valtorta:

No. 1: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" (Luke 23:34)
No. 2: "I tell you, today you will be with Me in Paradise." (Luke 23:43)
No. 3: "Mother! Mother!" (…)
No. 4: "Woman, behold your son. Son, behold your Mother." (John 19:26-27)
No. 5: "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?" (Matthew 27:46; Mark 15:34)
No. 6: "I am thirsty!" (John
19:28) No. 7: "Mother!"
No. 8: "Mother, where are you? I can't see you anymore. Are you abandoning me too?"
No. 9: "It is finished!" (John 19:30)
No. 10: "Father, into your hands I commit my spirit!" (Luke 23:46)
No. 11: a "loud cry," the first part of the word "Mother"

609.15 (...) *Jesus (...) in his weakness, he murmurs the name*

that he had only spoken from the depths of his heart: "Mother! Mother!" He murmurs it softly, as if in a sigh, as if he were already experiencing a slight delirium that prevents him from holding back as much as he would like. And Mary cannot help but reach out her arms to him each time (...) The cruel people laugh at this spasm of the dying man and at the woman who shares it.
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Theological Error No. 77: The shepherds of the Nativity are present on the Way of the Cross and at Golgotha

608.6 (...) *It is here that I see the small group of shepherds emerge from behind the rubble, perhaps from some collapsed wall. Desolate, distraught, dusty, and torn, they call to the Master with their eyes. And He turns His head, sees them... (...) and smiles... (...) He turns His head with difficulty (...) and smiles at them again...*
609.15 (...)
They climb up again behind the shepherds, who are now standing in the small square below, along with the priests and scribes. When the soldiers try to push them back, they react by saying:
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

The eleven apostles all fled during Jesus' agony; only St. John had the courage to be on Golgotha. It would have been an even greater shame for the apostles if the shepherds had had this courage. The heroic presence of the shepherds diminishes the heroism of the women disciples mentioned in the Gospels in Matthew 27:55: "*There were also many women there, watching from a distance, who had followed Jesus from Galilee to serve him." (56)Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of Zebedee's sons.*

Does Maria Valtorta imply that the evangelists

hid the courage and fidelity of the shepherds towards Jesus?

Theological Error No. 78: The Gospel speaks of darkness, Maria Valtorta sees a "strange light," "frightening."

609.15 (...) *we cannot see far in this strange light." In fact, many are beginning to be impressed by the light that is enveloping the world, and some are afraid (...) of the increasingly dark clouds (...) this twilight and frightening light (...).* Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Theological Error No. 79: Joseph of Arimathea was present at Golgotha before Jesus' death, whereas the Gospel says that he came there after his death.

Gospel of Matthew 27 [57] *In the evening, a rich man from Arimathea, named Joseph, who was also a disciple of Jesus, came.* [58] *He went to Pilate and asked for Jesus' body. And Pilate ordered that it be given to him.* [59] *Joseph took the body, wrapped it in a white shroud.*

Theological Error No. 80: Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea give money to the soldiers so they can come to Golgotha.

This makes no sense since they have (in Valtorta's vision) a pass from Pilate. Furthermore, other Jews are present at Golgotha, so there is no need to pay the soldiers.

609.16 *(...) in this light from the seabed, Nicodemus and Joseph emerge from behind the Jews (...) "What do you want?" say the soldiers. "To pass. We are friends of Christ." (...) Soldier, here is the purse and the pass." And he hands the nearest decurion a purse and a wax tablet*

. The decurion (...) says to the soldiers, "Let the two of them go." Joseph and Nicodemus approach the shepherds (...) in the increasingly thick fog (...)
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29 T10ch609.

Theological Error No. 81: Valtorta contradicts herself on the stigmatization of the Virgin

609.18 – *At a certain moment, Jesus sinks forward and downward, as if he were already dead. He no longer gasps for breath, his head hangs limply forward. His body, from the hips upward, is completely detached, forming an angle with the arms of the cross. Mary cries out, "He is dead!" (...) And Jesus seems truly dead.*
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

MV stated in her Vision of March 28, 1944. T1ch31. T1ch20.8 that the Virgin Mary was stigmatized:
"I felt in my mind the pain of the whips and thorns, the torture of the nails and the cross (...)" But here, Mary feels nothing to the point of not being able to tell the difference between the life and death of her child. She mistakenly believes that her son is dead when he is still alive.

Theological Error No. 82: Jesus does not control the hour of his death; he is struck with a stone, which brings him out of his agony.

Theological Error No. 83: Jesus is stoned while crucified.

609.18 (…) a volley of stones and clods of earth fly toward the cross, striking the Martyr and falling back onto the Roman armor (…) a stone struck (…) the wound on a hand or the head itself (…) Jesus utters a

pitiful groan and comes back to Himself. His chest begins to breathe again with great difficulty (...) Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Contrary to the false visions of Maria Valtorta, Jesus showed great nobility and complete self-control throughout his Passion and also on the cross. It is entirely false to claim that Jesus was the victim of stones or clods of earth thrown at him, as Maria Valtorta writes. Despite the horrible torture, Jesus died when he chose to die. The centurion understood this well, for he had experience with many crucifixions.

Theological Error No. 84: Valtorta contradicts Matthew 27:48

609.19 (...) "Eloi, Eloi, lamma sabachthani!" (...) "Let us see if Elijah, whom he calls, comes to save him." (...) But no soldier gives him vinegar, and no one comes from Heaven to comfort him. It is the solitary, total, cruel, even supernaturally cruel agony of the Great Victim.
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Matthew 27[45] From the sixth hour until the ninth hour, darkness came over the whole land. [46] Around the ninth hour, Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eli, Eli, lamma sabachthani," which means, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" ([47]) Some of those who stood there, when they heard this, said, "He is calling Elijah." ([48]) Immediately one of them ran and got a sponge, filled it with vinegar, put it on a stick, and gave him a drink. ([49]) The others said, "Leave him alone; let's see if Elijah will come to save him." ([50]) Jesus cried out again in a loud voice and gave up his spirit.

Indecency No. 14: Jesus on the cross "*He looks like a hungry child seeking his mother's breast."*

609.20 (...) the plaintive voice of Jesus: "I am thirsty!" (...) A soldier goes to a vase where the executioner's assistants have put vinegar mixed with gall (...) He takes the sponge dipped in the liquid, puts it on the end of a reed (...) and offers the sponge to the dying man. Jesus eagerly reaches for the approaching sponge. He looks like a hungry child seeking his mother's breast. (...) Jesus, who has eagerly sucked the bitter drink, turns his head away in disgust (...) 609.21 – He withdraws, sinks down, and gives himself up.
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

John 19[28] *After this, Jesus, knowing that all was now accomplished, said, "I am thirsty." ([29]) There was a jar full of vinegar there, so the soldiers filled a sponge with it, put it on the end of a hyssop branch, and held it up to his mouth. ([30]) When Jesus had taken the vinegar, he said, "It is finished," and bowing his head, he gave up his spirit.*

This false vision demeans Jesus, insinuating that he lost control of himself and presented the spectacle of a "hungry child seeking his mother's breast."

Blasphemy and Insults against the Virgin Mary

With these visions of March 27, 1945 (ch609 ed. fr.), February 19, 1944, and October 4, 1944, begin the most blasphemous and ignoble passages of Maria Valtorta's "The Gospel as Revealed to Me."

Visions that the American writer Sandra Miesel describes, in her famous article of September 14, 2021,
as "morbid hysteria with incestuous overtones" (see the article published at the end of the book under "Anti-Semitism No. 7").

These unbearable lines are one of the three reasons that led me to write and publish this book to defend the honor of the Most Holy Virgin Mary, my mother.

Mary probably went through a terrible night of faith at the foot of the Cross, but she never lost control of herself to indulge in all the shameful things that Valtorta imagines. If these visions come from the devil, it is obvious that he must have taken enormous pleasure in trampling on and despising the Mother of Jesus in this way.

"Mary surpasses all the saints in holiness, innocence, and fullness of heavenly grace" (cf. Denz. No. 2800 s, 3370, 3917), and she never made the contemptible gestures or uttered the words that Maria Valtorta attributes to her.

Indecency No. 15 Mary: ***I cannot even give Him a drop of my tears.***

Indecency No. 16 Mary: ***My breast, why do you no longer give milk?***

Theological Error No. 85 and Indecency No. 17: Mary: ***God, why, why have you forsaken us?***

Theological Error No. 86 and Indecency No. 18: Mary: ***A miracle for my Son!***

Theological Error No. 87 and Indecency No. 19: Mary: ***Let me give him my blood to drink, since I have no milk?***

609.20 (...) *Mary, who sees and certainly has this thought, groans, leaning on John: "Oh! And I cannot even give Him a drop of my tears... Oh! My breast, why do you no longer give milk? Oh! God, why, why do you abandon us like this? A miracle for my Son! Who will lift me up so that I may give him my blood to drink, since I have no milk?..."*
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Far from rebelling as Valtorta describes her in a sacrilegious manner, Mary communed perfectly with the suffering and will of the Redeemer, without any rebellion on her part (cf. Denzinger a3274 s, b3370, 3926, ab4177).

She probably went through a dark night of faith, but it is contrary to her very high holiness to assert that she lacked prudence and discretion in publicly manifesting this trial.

Indecency No. 20: *Like a child complaining, Jesus calls out, "Mommy!"*

609.20 (...) *Then, like a child complaining, Jesus calls out, "Mommy!"* Vision March 27, 1945. T9 ch29 Nv T10 ch609.

Maria Valtorta infantilizes Jesus, whereas the Gospel shows him to be perfectly devoted to his Father until the very end. Maria Valtorta makes him into a man who, reduced to the extreme, has no other recourse than to call his mother for help.

Indecency No. 21: Ridiculing Mary "Yes, my Treasure, I am here."

609.20 (...) And the unfortunate woman murmurs: "Yes, my Treasure, I am here." Vision March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Indecency No. 22: Ridiculing and infantilizing Jesus: "Mommy, where are you? I can't see you anymore. Are you abandoning me too?"

609.20 (...) And when her vision becomes clouded, she says: "Mum, where are you? I can't see you anymore. Are you abandoning me too?" Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Indecency No. 23: Ridiculing Mary: "Mummy is here, she's here"

609.20 (...) Mommy is here, she is here... and her only torment is not being able to come to you..." Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Indecency No. 24: Belittling Jesus: "Imminent death makes him talk as if he were delirious and doesn't even know what he's saying."

Indecency No. 25: ***Belittling Jesus: [He] does not understand.***

609.20 (...) John weeps uncontrollably. Jesus must hear his sobs, but he says nothing. I think that imminent death makes him speak as if he were delirious and does not even know what he is saying and, unfortunately, does not even understand his mother's comfort and the love of his Beloved. Vision March 27, 1945. T9 ch29, T10 ch609.

Indecency No. 26: Lowering Jesus: his last thought is not for his heavenly Father but for his mother.

See Father Guillaume Chevallier: [according to the false apparitions of Maria Valtorta] "on the Cross (...) Jesus is turned more towards his mother than towards the Eternal Father."

609.22 (...) The whole body tenses (...) terrible to behold, and then a powerful cry, unthinkable in this exhausted body, bursts forth, tearing the air, the "great cry" spoken of in the Gospels, which is the first part of the word "Mother"... And then nothing... The head falls back onto the chest (...) He has expired.
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Indecency No. 27: Mary "mouth open" "eyes dilated"

Lower Mary: she is not stigmatized and God does not make her understand that her Son is dead; she must understand this by looking very closely. She "has her mouth open," "her eyes dilated," "*She cannot believe*

that her Jesus is no longer there."

This is the exact opposite of what actually happened. Mary suffers infinitely but offers herself to God in union with her son, who offers himself to God.

Valtorta piles up descriptions that are hateful and offensive to the Virgin Mary.

609.24 – *Mary raises her head (...) and looks at her Jesus. (...) Three times she calls him: "Jesus! Jesus! Jesus!" (...) she sees him, motionless, leaning forward, with his head bowed so low (...) and she understands. She stretches out her hands, which are trembling in the dark air, and cries out: "My Son! My Son! My Son!" Then she listens... Her mouth is open, she seems to want to listen even with her eyes wide open, to see, to see... She cannot believe that her Jesus is no longer there...* March 27, 1945. T9ch29 T10ch609.

Indecency No. 28: Mary "cries out," "staggers," and almost falls.

609.24 (...) *Mary, who has understood, breaks free (...) and cries out: "I have no Son!" Then she staggers and would fall if John did not catch her and hold her close to his heart, then he sits down on the ground to better support her* (...) Vision March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

In immense pain, one remains silent; the suffering is so intense that it is no longer possible to speak. With Valtorta, it is quite the opposite; she puts a stream of idiotic words into the mouth of the Virgin Mary, worthy of a hysterical or psychotic person.

Theological Error No. 88: Valtorta contradicts Matthew 27:52-53 regarding the saints who rose after Jesus' resurrection.

609.29 (...) Others groan: "The tombs! The tombs!" Joseph grabs someone (...) and calls out to him: "Simon, what are you saying?" "Leave me alone! You're dead too! All of you dead people! Get out! And they curse me." (...) The city is in the grip of terror. (...) Many tombs had been opened by the earthquake, and there were people who swore they had seen skeletons come out, which for a moment took on a human appearance and went away accusing those guilty of deicide and cursing them.
Vision March 7, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Matthew 27:52 "*The tombs were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had been laid there rose again. They came out of the tombs after Jesus' resurrection and went into the holy city and appeared to many."*

The Gospels affirm that the resurrections took place in Jerusalem after Jesus' resurrection.

Valtorta writes that this happened at the death of Jesus (therefore before his resurrection).

Theological Error No. 89: Valtorta contradicts the *Acts of the Apostles* on Gamaliel.

609.30 (...) *Gamaliel raises his terrified face (...) He sees (...) enough to understand that Jesus is dead. (...) He kneels down, stretches out his arms and cries: "It was You! It was You! We can no longer be forgiven. We asked for your Blood upon us. And he cries out to Heaven, and Heaven curses us... Oh! But you were Mercy! (...) Sprinkle us with him! For he alone can obtain forgiveness for us..." (…)*

Have mercy on me! (...) Send down one of your rays! (...) Work the miracle of raising a flower that bears your name in this poor heart of a stubborn old Israelite. (...) Isaiah said: "... he paid for sinners and took upon himself the sins of multitudes." Oh! Mine too, Jesus of Nazareth..." Vision March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

The *Acts of the Apostles* present Gamaliel as a prudent Pharisee who does not believe that Jesus is the Christ, whereas Valtorta presents him as not only convinced but praying to Jesus to save him and forgive him for his previous refusal to believe in him.

Acts 5 [34] *But a Pharisee named Gamaliel, a teacher of the law, who was honored by all the people, stood up in the Sanhedrin and ordered that the apostles be taken outside for a while. [35] He said, "Men of Israel, be careful what you are about to do to these men. ([36]) For not long ago Theudas appeared, claiming to be someone important, and about four hundred men rallied to him. He was killed, and all who followed him were scattered and reduced to nothing. ([37])After him, Judas the Galilean appeared at the time of the census and attracted people to his side. He too perished, and all his followers were scattered. (38[)]Now this is my advice to you: Leave these men alone and let them go. If this idea or this work is of men, it will be destroyed, ([39]) but if it is from God, you will not be able to destroy it. Do not run the risk of fighting against God himself." ([40]) They agreed with him, and when they had called back the apostles, they had them beaten and ordered them not to speak in the name of Jesus, and then they released them. ([41]) The apostles left the Sanhedrin, rejoicing that they had been counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name of Jesus. ([42]) And every day, in the temple and in homes, they never stopped proclaiming Jesus as the Christ.*

Scientific error No. 40: Mary "separates her hair in disarray and puts it back in order," whereas the Holy Shroud proves that Jesus' hair was tied back in a short braid that hung down his neck.

Indecency No. 29: Hysterical portrayal of the Virgin Mary: Mary is said to have cried out and fainted when she saw Jesus' heart: *"She sees (...) the heart of her Son. She cries out, then (...) She cries out (...) and appears dead (...).*

In reality, a person undergoing such violent and profound suffering as the Virgin Mary is like someone who has been knocked unconscious; she does not engage in all these gestures, caresses, kisses, and cleansing with her tears.

Valtorta invents a drama that paradoxically minimizes and diminishes the immeasurable suffering of the Mother of Jesus.

609.33 – *Once ashore (...) Mary wants it. She opens her cloak (...) and spreads her knees to make a cradle for her Jesus (...) Now he is on his Mother's knees... He looks like a tired child sleeping curled up on his mother's lap (...) Then she caresses his cheeks, especially where there are bruises and swelling, she kisses his sunken eyes, his mouth slightly twisted to the right and half open. She wants to tidy his hair, as she did with his bloodstained beard (...) She leans over to kiss away all the scratches from the thorns. With her trembling hand, she separates his messy hair, tidies it up, cries, and speaks softly (...) She keeps caressing His face, then His hands, then His knees covered with bruises, then she goes back up to wipe the Body on which her many tears fall. (...) Her hand encounters the opening in His side. The little hand (...) enters almost entirely into the large hole of the wound. Mary*

leans forward (...) and sees (...) the open side and the heart of her Son. She cries out. It seems as if a sword is piercing her heart too. She cries out, then falls back on her Son and appears to be dead herself.
Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Indecency No. 30: Lowering the Virgin Mary: "she cries out."

609.34 *(...) they want to take the divine Dead One away from her. She cries out: "Where, where shall I put you? In what place that is safe and worthy of You?" Joseph (...) said: (...) My tomb is new and worthy of a great man. I give it to Him (...) I beg you, since evening is approaching, let us do this (...)*
Vision March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Indecency No. 31: Ridiculing Mary: "Mary never tires of caressing these icy limbs of his body," *she* kisses *his fingers*, the wound in his side, she moans and cries out.

610.3 *(...) Mary never tires of caressing these icy limbs (...) she takes the poor torn hands, squeezes them in hers, kisses the fingers, stretches them out, tries to bring the lips of the wounds together as if to heal them so that they hurt less, she presses these hands, which can no longer caress, against her cheeks (...) She straightens and joins the poor feet (...) Then she returns to the body and caresses it, so cold and already stiff. She sees once again the tear caused by the spear (...) Mary cries out again as she did on Calvary. It seems as if the spear is piercing her (...) How many kisses on that wound (...) Then she returns to the head (...) She tries to close the eyelids that stubbornly remain half-open, and the mouth that remains open (...) She combs the hair (...) she does not stop moaning because she remembers when he was a child... This is the fundamental cause of her pain: the*

memory of Jesus' childhood (...) Vision of February 19, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

According to Valtorta, immersed in the immense suffering of Jesus' death, Mary sought to satisfy herself with caresses and kisses on the corpse, with a psychological block on childhood.

Traumatized by what she had just experienced, her only way of overcoming the ordeal was to return in her mind to Jesus' childhood and to manipulate, kiss, and caress his corpse in order to relive those happy moments of Jesus' childhood.

So this is not a Mary who faces and accepts reality, but a Mary who takes refuge in the past and needs physical sensations: to kiss and caress her son's corpse.

Moreover, this is a Virgin Mary who cries out. The Mother of Jesus is portrayed as a mother who has lost her mind, who flees reality and seeks to relive the past.

This is the exact opposite of the real Virgin Mary, who did not make a spectacle of herself either on Calvary or in the tomb.

The real Mary lived the Passion by turning entirely to God, praying to God, thinking of God, accepting, offering, and fulfilling the role her Son asked her to play; not by seeking consolation through caresses, kisses, and insane gestures.

Furthermore, the wound from the spear is the only one that did not cause Jesus any pain, since he was already dead.

Indecency No. 32: Portraying Mary as a madwoman rocking Jesus as if he were a newborn baby

610.4 (...) *"What have they done to you, what have they done to you, my Son?" (...)*

she takes him in her arms (...) rocking him, in the same way as in the cave of the Nativity (...) Vision of February 19, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

What mother, when she has lost her son, would act this way with his corpse?

Theological Error No. 90: *"this God who is in Me to work the miracle of Redemption"*

61.2 (...) You men (...) be—I beg you for your own good and because I love you as only God can love, this God who is in Me to work the miracle of Redemption—be at least as you judge this animal should be.
November 4, 1944. T2ch24 T1ch61.

This sentence introduces a duality between the human person of Jesus and his divine nature, which seems to be a foreign reality. It suggests a dualism between the human "I" and "God" as a third party. It denies the personal unity of Christ as a divine Person. "God" is like a foreign entity.

This error is a form of Nestorianism, condemned by the Church.

God is not IN Jesus. Jesus IS God.

Jesus is one person in two natures.

Jesus is not two distinct persons, one divine and the other human with divinity within him. Jesus is true God and true man. Jesus is not a true man with God inside him.

Council of Ephesus, June 22, 431, 2nd letter of Cyril of Alexandria to Nestorius: "For it is not an ordinary man who was first begotten of the holy Virgin and upon whom the Word then descended, but it is for

have been united with his humanity from the very womb that he is said to have undergone fleshly generation, inasmuch as he appropriated the generation of his own flesh." Cf. Denzinger No. 251.

Indecency No. 33: To belittle Mary, to make her appear as a kind of madwoman, uttering words incompatible with the extreme pain she was experiencing.

When one is completely crushed by pain and plunged into the dark night of faith (cf. St. John of the Cross, *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*), one does not engage in such discourse. These lines minimize the suffering endured by Mary.

Indecency No. 34: Mary speaks to the corpse as if she did not know that Jesus' soul could hear her without addressing the corpse.

Theological Error No. 91 and Indecency No. 35: Mary complains, whereas the true Virgin Mary knew exactly the importance and role of these sufferings and of this horrible Passion, and she adhered with all her soul to the will of God and therefore to what had happened.

Indecency No. 36: Mary tells the corpse that she will heal his wounded hand if Jesus gives it to her.

Indecency No. 37: Mary tells the corpse that she will not hurt him: he is a corpse, so he can no longer feel pain.

Indecency No. 38: Mary tells the corpse that she will warm his wounded hand with her kisses, her tears, her breath, and her love.

610.6 – *"Poor Son! (...) Look what they have done to you! ... How cold you are, Son! Your fingers are frozen, and how lifeless they are! They look broken. Never, not even in the deepest sleep of childhood, nor in the weariness of your work as a craftsman, were they like this...And how cold they are! Poor hands! Give them to your mother, my treasure, my holy love, my love! Look how pierced they are! But look, John, what a tear! Oh, how cruel! Here, here, give your mother this wounded hand. Let me take care of it. Oh, I won't hurt you... I will use kisses and tears, and with my breath and my love I will warm them. October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.*

Indecency No. 39: Mary asks that Jesus' corpse give her "a caress."

Indecency No. 40: Mary evokes the importance of Jesus' caresses in her life.

Addiction to her son's caresses?

Indecency No. 41: Mary complains: "Inhuman torment!"

610.6 (...) *Give me a caress, Son! You are ice, I am burning with fever. My fever will be relieved by your ice, and your ice will soften at the touch of my fever. A caress, Son! It has only been a few hours since you last caressed me, and they seem like centuries. There have been months without your caresses, and they seem like hours, because I was always waiting.*

Your arrival (...) Why is it taking so long now? Oh, inhuman torment! Because you are dead. They killed you! October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Theological Error No. 92 and Indecency No. 42: Mary says that the wicked "took the soul from my Son," when no one took his life; he alone decided on his death.

Indecency No. 43: Mary insults: "cruel hyenas united with Satan."

The true Virgin Mary never insulted anyone.

Indecency No. 44: Mary calls out and addresses people who are not present; she speaks into the void; she speaks to herself.

610.6 (...) *You are no longer on Earth! No longer! Wherever I send my soul to seek yours and embrace it, since finding you, possessing you, feeling you was the life of my flesh and spirit, wherever I seek you with the flood of my love, I no longer find you, I no longer find you! All that remains of you is this cold corpse, this soulless corpse! O soul of my Jesus, O soul of my Christ, O soul of my Lord, where are you? Why did you take my Son's soul, you cruel hyenas united with Satan?* Oct. *4*, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Indecency No. 45: Mary does not understand Jesus' prophecies and words concerning his crucifixion, since she regrets not having been crucified with him.

610.6 (…) *And why did you not crucify me with Him? Were you afraid of a second crime? (Her voice becomes*

louder and more heart-rending.) October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

We profess the opinion that the Virgin Mary was the first to be stigmatized and that she suffered invisibly and mystically all the sufferings of her Son. Therefore, from this point of view, it is false to say that she was not crucified with her Son. It is highly probable that in an invisible and supernatural way, Mary experienced the Passion of her Son through a miracle of stigmatization.

Indecency No. 46: Mary accuses the Jews of not hesitating to "kill God made flesh"

Mary accuses the Jews of not hesitating to "kill God made flesh" when Jesus on the cross said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," and St. Peter wrote that the Jews acted out of ignorance (Acts 3:17).

And what was it to kill a poor woman, for you who did not hesitate to kill God made flesh?
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Indecency No. 47: Mary asserts that not killing him with her son constitutes a second crime.

610.6 (…) *Have you not committed a second crime? And is it not the most infamous of all to let a mother survive her Son who has been put to death?"* October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Indecency No. 48: Mary speaks harshly to Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, and Saint John.

Indecency No. 49: Mary asks to be locked in the tomb for three days.

She stands up and says loudly to those present: "Go away, all of you. I am staying. Lock me in here with Him. I am waiting for Him. What are you saying? That it is not possible? Why is it not possible? (...) What are you saying, Nicodemus? That I will be contaminated? His Blood is not contamination. I was not contaminated when I gave birth to Him (...)
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

If the Virgin Mary had wanted to be locked up for three days in the Holy Sepulchre, she would have violated Jewish customs and committed an act of disrespect. This would have scandalized the apostles and disciples. Such a request would have made her appear insane. Therefore, the Virgin Mary never made such a request, which would have been contrary to her supreme perfection.

Indecency No. 50: Mary asks questions of the corpse.

610.8 – Now the torn Mother bends over her Son once more, remaining indifferent to everything that is not Him, and she whispers softly: "But do You remember, Son, that sublime garment of splendor that clothed all things when Your smile first appeared in the world? Do you remember that blissful light that the Father sent from Heaven to envelop the mystery of your blossoming and make this dark world less repulsive to you (...)
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610. .

Indecency No. 51: Mary orders Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, and Saint John to leave the tomb and leave her there for three days without food or water.

610.9 – *The voice rose and now, with*

all its strength, it said: "Go. I am staying. You will return in three days and we will leave together. Oh! To see the world again leaning on your arm, O my Son! October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

The delirious gestures and words that Maria Valtorta attributes to the Virgin Mary are serious offenses against her; they are real blasphemies.

Indecency No. 52: Mary, in her son's tomb, evokes the "sweet thrill (...) that moves a virgin when (...) she hears the footsteps of her husband coming for the wedding."

610.9 (...) *How beautiful the world will be in the light of your resurrected smile! The world trembling at the footsteps of its Lord! The earth shook when death tore your soul from you and your spirit left your heart. But now it will tremble... oh! No longer with horror and pain, but with a sweet thrill that I do not know, but which my femininity intuits, which moves a virgin when, after an absence, she hears the footsteps of her husband coming for the wedding.*
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Theological Error No. 93 and Indecency No. 53: The Father and the Holy Spirit created the "seed" from which Jesus came.

Theological Error No. 94 and Indecency No. 54: Jesus came from a miraculous "seed."

Theological Error No. 95 and Indecency No. 55: Mary speaks of "seed."

610.9 (…) when I had within me the One and Triune Lord, and when the will of the Father, with the fire of Love, created the seed from which you came, O my holy Little One, my Child (...) October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

The first error is to separate the works of the Holy Trinity, whereas its works are inseparably performed by the Three Persons together. Never do the Father and the Holy Spirit perform a miracle without the Son, for there is only one God, and God alone performs every miracle. The works of the Trinity are inseparable, not separate, common; no person acts before or after another, or without another, cf. Council of Toledo, Denz. No. 531:

The works of the Trinity are inseparable, not separate, common; no person [of the Holy Trinity] acts before or after another, or without another.

Another Error: The miracle of the Incarnation did not come about through the coming of a miraculous seed. Such a thing is not taught by the Church.

Gospel according to Saint Luke 1:35 "The angel answered her, 'The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. Therefore, the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God.'"

The Magisterium teaches that the Word was born of the Virgin "without the seed of man."

Let us quote the Profession of Faith against the errors of the Priscillianists: "This Son of God, therefore, God, born of the Father before all beginning, was sanctified in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, and from her, begotten without the seed of a man, he took true humanity (that is, two natures, namely, divinity and flesh, united completely in one person), namely, the Lord Jesus Christ."

Finally, at the time of the Virgin Mary, it was believed that a man "deposited" a fetus in his wife. If the uterus was warm, it would produce a boy. If the uterus was cold, it would produce a girl. Sperm was not discovered until 1666. It is therefore completely impossible (apart from the delusional aspect of imagining the Virgin Mary talking about
"seed" in her son's tomb) that the Virgin Mary would use this word.

Theological Error No. 96: Concentrated divine perfume made Mary pregnant.

18.1 Mary (...) The mere sight of her fills my soul (...) with the divine perfume that was concentrated on Mary to make her a mother.
March 25, 1944. T1ch27. T1. Ch18.

Indecency No. 56: Mary speaks of "bastard"

610.9 (...) *Every child has a father and a mother, even a bastard has a father and a mother.*
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Theological Error No. 97: Mary claims to be the author of the miracle of the Incarnation.

610.9 (...) *you had only your mother to make your flesh* (...) *to make you these* (...) *veins* (...) *and these lips* (...) *and this hair* (...) *and these eyes* (...) *It was only your mother who did this to you with her "yes"...*
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

God alone is the author of the miracle of the Incarnation. Mary gave her consent, but she is not the author of the miracle. The Incarnation was not a co-production between God and a creature. God alone created a body and soul for himself

soul so that the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, the Word, could unite himself to this body and soul without changing anything of his divine nature.

Indecency No. 57: Mary lets out a heart-rending cry in the tomb.

610.10 – Your heart, what is it? (…) *That is what your heart is. Ah! (The cry is so heart-rending that Magdalene rushes to her aid, along with John. The others dare not move and, weeping and veiled, they peek through the opening).* October *4*, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Indecency No. 58: Mary wants to warm and rock the corpse of Jesus.

610.10 (...) Before death kills me, I want to warm you, I want to rock you. (...) *And sitting down on the edge of the stone, she takes him on her lap, putting one arm of her Son over her shoulders, resting his head on her shoulder and pressing her head against his, holding him close to her breast, rocking him, kissing him (*...). October 4 , 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Indecency No. 59: Mary says, "If I can warm him up, he will come back to life sooner."

Indecency No. 60: Valtorta insults the Virgin Mary: "The Sorrowful Mother is almost delirious."

610.11 Nicodemus and Joseph approach, placing (...) vases and strips of cloth and a clean shroud and a basin filled with water (...) Mary sees and asks aloud, "What are you doing? (...) Preparing him? Why? Leave him on

his mother's knees. If I can warm him up, he will rise sooner. If I can console the Father and console Him of the hatred that killed Him, the Father will forgive sooner, and He will return sooner." The Sorrowful Mother is almost delirious. October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Valtorta upsets the psychological balance of the Virgin Mary. This balance was perfect: she suffered more than any other saint, but always in perfect and total harmony with God's will. Because of her Immaculate Conception, Mary lived on earth in perfect harmony between body and spirit. She did not suffer our inner disorders, our concupiscence, our inclinations toward evil. Her inner freedom was perfect, and her gift of herself to God, her adherence to God's will, was spontaneous and constant. One could almost say "violent" because the vehemence of her love for God is so powerful, nuclear, cosmic. Her physical suffering was probably abysmal because of the miracle of the invisible stigmata. Her moral suffering is beyond our comprehension (Luke 2:35: "a sword will pierce your soul
"); but his suffering was without rebellion, without inner turmoil.

She suffered immensely but in peace, in total love for God. She was never distorted or dominated by her emotions; each of the powerful emotions she experienced remained perfectly aligned, orderly, transfigured by grace.

Her lucidity during the Passion was complete. To say that Mary "almost raved" borders on blasphemy, for she suffered no loss of reason, no disordered turmoil.

Because of our fragility, we can go off the rails in extreme pain, but there was no such disorder in Mary. Her dignity and nobility in the trial were more than heroic, without any uncontrolled weakness, without any

sign of confusion.

Theological Error No. 98 and Indecency No. 61: Mary refuses to allow the body to be washed.

610.11 (...) "No, I will not give him to you! I gave him once, once I gave him to the world and it did not want him. It killed him because it did not want him. Now I will not give him anymore! October 4*,* 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Indecency No. 62: Mary, ungrateful, overwhelms Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea.

610.11 (...) What are you saying? That you loved him? Fine! But why didn't you defend him? You waited to tell him that you loved him until he was no longer someone who could hear you. What poor love you have! But if you feared the world so much that you did not dare to defend an innocent man, you should at least have given him back to me (...) You had him as your Master, but you learned nothing. (...) October *4,* 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Mary accuses Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea of not defending Jesus and of waiting until his death to tell him they loved him. She says this to them at the very moment when these two remarkable men openly declare themselves in favor of Jesus, at the very moment when they are risking their lives and all their possessions for the help they have given Christ by their request to Pilate and by the care they are giving to Jesus' body.

Mary said to them, "What poor love you have!" at the very moment when they were acting heroically with totally selfless love, since, humanly speaking, Jesus had been defeated and had died in the most appalling manner possible for a Jewish believer.

Valtorta describes a Virgin Mary who is ungrateful and wicked; this vision cannot come from God.

Indecency No. 63: Mary speaks rudely to Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea.

610.11 (...) you have learned nothing. Is that not true, perhaps? Am I lying, perhaps?
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Theological Error No. 99 and Indecency No. 64: Burying Jesus with spit and filth would be a sign of faith in his resurrection.

Theological Error No. 100 and Indecency No. 65: Mary wants to violate religious customs and place Jesus in the tomb in filth.

Theological Error No. 101 and Indecency No. 66: Jesus "*only a tired man resting*."

610.11 (...) But (...) you do not believe in his Resurrection? Do you believe in it? No. Why are you here, preparing bandages and spices? Because you think he is a poor dead man, cold today, tomorrow decayed, and that is why you want to embalm him. Leave your ointments there. Come and worship the Savior with the pure hearts of the shepherds of Bethlehem. Look: in his sleep, he is only a weary man resting (...) October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Mary declares that caring for Jesus' body is useless since he will rise again. This goes against common sense, religious customs, and God's will.

Indecency No. 67: "For his mother, he is just a tired little boy who is sleeping."

610.11 (...) Now he is resting. For me, for his mother, he is just a tired little boy who is sleeping. How miserable his bed and his room are! (...) October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Mary describes the dead Jesus as a "great tired Child who sleeps," a childish expression that ridicules the mother of Jesus. This is one of Valtorta's many infantilizing projections, a disabled woman deprived of marital affection and motherhood. Valtorta cannot conceive that Mary did not remain stuck in the memory of the maternal joys of Jesus' early childhood. Valtorta proves incapable of understanding the nature and almost infinite richness of the relationship between the adult Jesus and his mother. For Valtorta, nothing surpasses the paradise of a mother with her baby.

This poverty in her conception of the bonds between Jesus and his mother probably stems from her failed marriage plans and her deprivation of motherhood.

Theological Error No. 102: "I, whom Motherhood makes a ritual priestess."

610.11 (...) And then, like the shepherds, go and tell the world: "Glory to God! Sin is dead! Satan is defeated! Peace be on Earth and in Heaven between God and man!" Prepare the way for his return. I send you, I who am made a ritual priestess by Motherhood. Go.
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Mary describes herself as a "ritual priestess," a problematic expression. Should we see a connection with those who wanted to represent Mary in priestly vestments? See "Are

images depicting Mary dressed in priestly vestments are condemned?" See Denzinger No. 3632.

Maria Valtorta, on the contrary, presented us with a Virgin Mary who opposed the sacrifice of her Son and asked God for a miracle to stop Jesus' death on the cross. According to "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," Mary did not understand what Jesus was doing and rebelled against what was happening to her son.

Indecency No. 68: Jesus will rise more easily if the burial cloths are not placed on him.

610.11 (...) I said I don't want it. I washed him with my tears and that is enough. The rest is useless, and don't even think of putting it on him. It will be easier for him to rise if he is free of these useless funeral bandages.
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Indecency No. 69: Mary makes two insulting insinuations towards Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea: "Has this day made you stupid? Have you lost your memory?"

610.11 (...) Why are you looking at me like that, Joseph? And you, Nicodemus? Has the horror of this day made you all numb? Have you lost your memory? Don't you remember? (...) October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

According to Maria Valtorta, in the midst of suffering, the Virgin Mary becomes cruel and hurtful in her words.

Indecency No. 70: Mary says to Nicodemus: *Do you think I'm crazy?*

610.11 (...) Why are you looking at me like that, Joseph? And you, Nicodemus? (...) Are you shaking your head? Do you pity me? Do you think I'm crazy? But how? He raised the dead, and He cannot raise Himself?
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Such a statement is unworthy of the Virgin Mary. She never said it.

Indecency No. 71: Mary utters an "inhuman cry."

Indecency No. 72: Mary says, "My reason is wavering."

610.13 – A grave and prolonged silence. Then an inhuman cry. Mary falters, bringing a hand to her heart (...) she cries out: "Back! (...) Be silent! I don't want to hear you! (...) It is Satan! Satan who says: 'He will not rise again. No prophet has said so" (...) My reason is wavering! I can't remember anything. What do the prophets say? What does the psalm say? (...)"
October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Indecency No. 73: Mary asks that the corpse caress her lips so that she may retain the strength to believe that Jesus will rise again.

610.13 (...) Sanctify my lips with a caress so that they may have the strength to say, "I believe," even against a whole world that does not believe (...) October 4, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

Theological Error No. 103: Redemption did not end with Jesus' last breath because Mary accomplished Redemption by struggling for three days.

610.16 – Jesus said: (...) *the Mother, the Woman, atoned for women, guilty of all evil, many times over.* (...) *The world believes that Redemption ended with my last breath. No. The Mother accomplished it, adding her triple torture to redeem the triple concupiscence, struggling for three days against Satan who wanted to make her deny my Word and not believe in my Resurrection. Mary was the only one who continued to believe (*...) October 4, 1944. *T9ch30. T10ch610.*

Response to the errors of Maria Valtorta:

Pius XII, encyclical Ad cæli Reginam, October 11, 1954: (...) in dealing with questions concerning the Blessed Virgin, theologians (...) should take care to avoid anything that might lead them astray (...) they should guard against (...) [from] exaggerated expressions that exceed the limits of truth (...)

On the fact that Jesus alone brings about Redemption:

"By his obedience unto death, Christ accomplished redemption and opened to all men the way to the freedom of the children of God" and he "accomplished the work of redemption through the paschal mystery of his suffering"

"Christ obtained all graces by his own merit" Denzinger No. 4103, 4005, 3370.

It is a serious theological error to assert that Redemption ended after the three days of suffering of the Virgin Mary, even though Mary holds a preeminent place in Redemption, since she is the mediatrix of all graces and her holiness is so great that even if all the holiness of all the saints in the history of humanity were gathered together to form a mountain, it would be only a humble mound, far from reaching the spiritual height of the Mother of Jesus.

Jesus is the meritorious cause of our justification, the Virgin Mary is not: "The meritorious cause [of the

justification of the ungodly] is the beloved only Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who, 'while we were enemies' (Romans 5:10), 'because of the great love with which he loved us " (Ephesians 2:4), merited for us justification through his most holy Passion on the wood of the cross, and satisfied God the Father for us." Cf. Council of Trent, Sixth Session (January 13, 1547), Chapter VII, on Justification.

Second Vatican Council, Lumen Gentium No. 62: *(...) From the consent she gave by her faith on the day of the Annunciation and which she maintained under the cross in her steadfastness* [whereas Valtorta writes that she rebelled against God's will and asked for a miracle to prevent her son's death on the cross]*, Mary's motherhood in the economy of grace continues uninterrupted until the final consummation of all the elect.*

Indeed, after her Assumption into heaven, her role in salvation does not cease: through her manifold intercession, she continues to obtain for us the gifts that ensure our eternal salvation. Her maternal love makes her attentive to her Son's brothers, whose pilgrimage is not yet complete and who are engaged in dangers and trials, until they reach their blessed homeland.

This is why the Blessed Virgin is invoked in the Church under the titles of Advocate, Helper, Benefactress, and Mediatrix, all of which are to be understood in such a way that no derogation or addition is made to the dignity and efficacy of the one Mediator, Christ.

For no creature can ever be placed on the same level as the incarnate Word and Redeemer.

But just as the priesthood of Christ is shared in various ways, both by ministers and by the faithful, and just as the one goodness of God

truly spreads in various forms in creatures, so the unique mediation of the Redeemer does not exclude, but rather gives rise to a varied cooperation on the part of creatures, in dependence on the one source.

The Church professes Mary's subordinate role without hesitation; she never ceases to experience it; she recommends it to the hearts of the faithful so that this maternal support and help may help them to attach themselves more intimately to the Mediator and Savior.

To praise the Virgin Mary, let us quote Pius XII and his encyclical *Ad cæli Reginam*, of October 11, 1954:

"To help us understand the sublime dignity that the Mother of God has attained above all creatures, we can consider that the Blessed Virgin, from the first moment of her conception, was filled with such an abundance of grace that she surpassed the grace of all the saints" (...)

Pius IX, Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, December 8, 1854:
"far above all the angels and saints," the ineffable God "enriched Mary with all the heavenly gifts drawn from the treasure of the divinity; thus, always preserved from the slightest stain of sin, all beautiful and perfect, she attained such a fullness of innocence and holiness that no one can imagine anything greater under God, and that no one, except God himself, will ever be able to comprehend."

"Furthermore, the Blessed Virgin not only attained the supreme degree of excellence and perfection after Christ, but she also participates in some way in the action by which her Son, our Redeemer, reigns over the minds and wills of men. For if the Word works miracles and pours out grace through his humanity, if he makes use of the

Sacraments and the Saints as instruments for the salvation of souls, why cannot he use his most Holy Mother to distribute to us the fruits of Redemption?"

"Truly, it is with a maternal heart, as Our Predecessor Pius IX also said, that, in dealing with the matter of our salvation, she is concerned for the whole human race, having been established by the Lord as Queen of heaven and earth and exalted above all the choirs of Angels and all the Saints in heaven at the right hand of her only Son, Jesus Christ Our Lord:

she obtains an audience through the power of her maternal supplications, she receives all that she asks for, and she never knows refusal."

Leo XIII, Encyclical *Adiutricem populi:* the Blessed Virgin Mary has almost unlimited power to grant graces.

Theological Error #204: Eve is described as a woman "guilty of all evil."

610.16 – Jesus said: (...) *the Mother, the Woman, atoned many times for the woman who was guilty of all evil.* (...) (...) October 4, 1944*. T9ch30. T10ch610.*

Describing Eve as "guilty of all evil" is a doctrinal error. Original sin is a fault shared by Adam and Eve. St. Paul says, "Through one man sin entered into the world" (Romans 5:12). The Church does not make Eve the cause of all evil. Adam bears some responsibility for having sinned himself and then, before God, shifting the blame onto Eve instead of humbly acknowledging his own fault. To say that Eve is guilty of all evil is a stupid, misogynistic, anti-biblical, anti-theological statement that is contrary to Catholic teaching.

Indecency No. 75: Mary "no longer controls herself and falls into a new crisis of desolation."

611.1 – Joseph of Arimathea (...) goes to the entrance of the tomb (...) Mary bows down once more to kiss her Son through the covers. And she would like to do so by controlling her grief in order to contain it in a form of respect for the Corpse (...) But when she is very close to the veiled face, she can no longer control herself and falls into a new fit of despair. She is lifted from there with difficulty and led away from the funeral bed with even greater difficulty. The disturbed cloths are put back in place, and it is more by carrying her than by supporting her that the poor Mother is led away. She moves away with her face turned back, to see, to see her Jesus who remains alone in the darkness of the tomb. Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 76: Mary cries out again: "a cry that shook even the fibers of the plants."

Indecency No. 77: Marie throws herself against the door.

Indecency No. 78: Marie attacks the door frame to push it away.

Indecency No. 79: Marie scrapes her fingers. Indecency

No. 80: Marie breaks her nails.

Indecency No. 81: Marie presses her head against
against the rough protrusion.

Indecency No. 82: ***Her moan sounds like the roar of a lioness.***

611.3 – They roll the heavy stone of the tomb into its place (...) Mary, who until then had been supported by John and was relatively calm in her sobbing, breaks free from the apostle and, with a cry that I believe shook even the fibers of the plants, throws herself against the door, attacking its protrusion to push it back. She scrapes her fingers and breaks her nails without success, and presses even her head against the rough protrusion. And her moan is like the roar of a lioness fainting on the threshold of the den where her cubs are enclosed (...). She is no longer the gentle Virgin of Nazareth, the patient woman we knew until then (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 83: Mary "the pain that makes her delirious."

Indecency No. 84: Mary speaks to the stone of the tomb and asks it to open.

Indecency No. 85: "After striking and bloodied with her hands the stone that resists."

Indecency No. 86: Mary asks them to open the tomb they have just closed.

Indecency No. 87: They use force against Mary: ***They try to untie her hands from the stone.***

Indecency No. 88: Those present are "frightened" by Mary's eyes. The Virgin Mary is frightening.

Indecency No. 89: Mary's eyes are rendered "hard and imperious, glassy, phosphorescent."

611.3 (...) all the rebellions (...) all the holy and lawful ferocity (...) are now stirring in her heart, boiling in her blood, and, sweet even in the pain that makes her delirious, (...) she asks only that the stone open, that it give way to her, for her place is inside, where He is. (...) After striking and bloodying the resistant stone with her hands, she turns, leans forward with her arms open, still embracing both sides of the stone, and, terrible in her majesty as the Sorrowful Mother, she commands: "Open! You don't want to? Well, I'm staying here. Inside, right? Then here, outside. This is where my bread and my bed are. This is where I live. I have no other home and no other purpose. You, go away. Go back to that awful world (...)" (...) They try to untie her hands from the stone, frightened by those eyes they do not yet know, with that gleam that makes them hard and imperious, glassy, phosphorescent. Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 90: Mary described as bipolar: she goes from a roaring lioness to a gentle dove, a kind of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

611.4 Violence is not the way of the gentle, and the humble do not know how to persist in pride... And Mary suddenly loses the vehemence of her will and the imperious nature of her command. She regains her gentle gaze of a tortured dove and loses the majesty of her gesture. She resumes a supplicating gesture and joins her hands in prayer: "Oh, leave me! In the name of your dead, in the name of the living whom you love, have mercy on a poor mother! (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 91: Mary "feels disgust and fear for man"

611.4 (...) I have been seeing the faces of murderers for almost twelve hours... Judas... the executioners... the priests... the Jews... All of them, all murderers! Go away! Go away! ... I don't want to see anyone anymore ... In every man there is a wolf and a snake. I feel disgust and fear for man ... Leave me here, under these quiet trees, on this flowery grass ... Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 92: Marie says that the stars have always been Jesus' friends and hers, that they kept him company during his agony, that they "know so much."

611.4 (...) Soon, there will be stars... They have always been his friends and mine... Last night they kept company with our lonely agony... They know so much... They come from God... Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 93: The Virgin Mary speaks of little birds.

Indecency No. 94: Mary says that tomorrow the doves will come with her to "beat" the stone of the tomb.

611.5 (...) I am sated with my pain and quenched with my tears... Here... Can you hear how the little cuckoo cries? He cries with me, and soon the nightingales will cry. And tomorrow, in the sunshine, the larks and the warblers and all the birds that He loved will cry, and the turtledoves will come with me to beat this stone and to say, and to say: "Arise, my love, and come! (...)

Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Valtorta presents a Virgin who does not seek support in silence and prayer. The most heroic and holy moments of Mary's life are ridiculed and dismissed as delusions. Valtorta presents a Virgin who is concerned only with the corpse, who lives in her memories, becomes mean and ungrateful to those who risk everything to help her, who turns to creatures (stars, birds, flowers) for comfort. Many readers say to themselves, "Yes, that's normal, she broke down, she went mad," when in fact the Virgin Mary had extraordinary inner strength, like her son. "Near the cross stood his mother, silent; alive, she was dying; dying, she was alive."

Indecency No. 95: Mary insults the Temple guards as cowards.

611.5 (…) "Look, Mary! The Temple guards are coming. Come, lest they despise you." "The guards? Their contempt? No. They are cowards, cowards. And if I walked over them, terrible in my pain, they would flee like Satan before God. Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 96: Mary says she would have the right to strike the Temple guards.

611.5 (...) But I remember that I am Mary... and I will not strike them as I would have the right to do. I will remain good (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 97 : Mary Magdalene acknowledges her "cowardice" and "unbelief" despite having shown heroic courage.

Theological Error No. 105: Mary Magdalene already believes in Jesus' resurrection, which contradicts John 20 [13] "And they said to her, 'Woman, why are you weeping?' She said to them, 'Because they have taken away my Lord, and I don't know where they have laid him.'"

611.6 (…) [Mary Magdalene:] *(…) You said it, after your just rebuke of our cowardice and unbelief (…) I say to you: "If we can unite in faith in his Resurrection, he will rise again more quickly. We will call him with our love..." (…)* [Mary:] *You are right. I must go back... to find the apostles... the disciples... the parents... everyone... (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.*

The idea that Mary Magdalene already believed in t he resurrection of Jesus is contradicted by the Gospels:

Luke 24. [1] But on the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they went to the tomb, taking the spices they had prepared. [2] They saw that the stone had been rolled away from the tomb, [3] and when they entered, they did not find the body of the Lord Jesus.

[4]While they were filled with anxiety about this, two men in dazzling clothes stood beside them. [5]As they were terrified and bowed their faces to the ground, they said to them, "Why do you look for the living among the dead? ([6])He is not here, but has risen. Remember what he told you while he was still in Galilee: ([7])The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinners

sinners, be crucified, and on the third day rise again."

8 Then they remembered Jesus' words, 9 and when they returned from the tomb, they told all these things to the Eleven and to all the others. (10)Those who told these things to the apostles were Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and their other companions. (11)But they regarded their words as nonsense and did not believe the women.

If the Virgin Mary had told them that Jesus was going to rise again, the apostles would have believed the women.

John 20. 1 On the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene went to the tomb early in the morning, before the darkness had lifted, and saw that the stone had been removed from the tomb.

2 So she ran and went to Simon Peter and the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and said to them, "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we don't know where they have laid him."

3 Peter went out with the other disciple, and they went to the tomb.
4They both ran together, but the other disciple ran faster than Peter and reached the tomb first. 5He bent down and saw the linen cloths lying there, but he did not go in. (6)Simon Peter, who was following him, came up and went into the tomb. (7)He saw the linen cloths lying there, and the cloth that had been on Jesus' head, not lying with the linen cloths but rolled up in a place by itself. (8)Then the other disciple, who had reached the tomb first, also went inside, and he saw and believed. (9)For they did not yet understand the Scripture, which said that he must rise from the dead.
10 So the disciples went home. 11
But Mary stood outside the tomb weeping, and as she wept, she bent over the

tomb, [12] and she saw two angels in white, sitting where the body of Jesus had been laid, one at the head and the other at the feet.

[13] And they said to her, "Woman, why are you weeping?" She said to them, "Because they have taken away my Lord, and I do not know where they have laid him." [14] Having said this, she turned around and saw Jesus standing there, and she did not know that it was Jesus.

[15]Jesus said to her, "Woman, why are you crying? Who are you looking for?" Thinking he was the gardener, she said to him, "Sir, if you've taken him away, tell me where you've put him, and I'll go and get him." ([16]) Jesus said to her, "Mary." She turned toward him and said in Hebrew, "Rabboni," which means "Teacher."

Indecency No. 98: Twice Mary cries out and then bends down to examine the ground

611.7 (…) Twice Mary cries out and bends down to examine the ground in the dim light, for she thinks she sees blood and believes it is that of her Jesus. But I believe it is only pieces of cloth torn in the confusion of the flight. Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 99: Jesus must not refuse what Mary wants

150.2 (...) Jesus speaks (...) of the need to approach women to redeem them and of his sorrow at not being able to do so because of the wickedness of men. Mary agrees and decides: " Son, you must not refuse me what I want. From now on I will come with you when you go away (...) I will defend you against slander. My mere presence will make the mud fall away (...) That is what is needed near the Holy One.

against the devil and the world: the hearts of mothers." April 30, 1945. T 3 ch 10. Nv. T 2 ch 150.

It is completely out of the question that Mary would change the organization of Jesus' public ministry. It is indecent to suggest that Mary would show such rudeness in her relationship with her son: *you must obey me*.

Moreover, the reason given is stupid: "the need to approach women in order to redeem them." On several occasions, Jesus spoke to women without needing his mother: the Samaritan woman, the Canaanite woman, Mary Magdalene, the adulterous woman, the widow of Nain, the woman afflicted with a flow of blood, Martha.

The Messiah of Israel who cannot go anywhere without his mother is ridiculous.

These false words put into Mary's mouth are all the more stupid since, according to Valtorta, Mary already knows that Jesus is God. Would Mary therefore consider herself in a position to explain to God how he should go about evangelizing women and proclaiming the Good News?

If the Magisterium has not decided when the Virgin Mary had the revelation of Jesus' dual divine and human nature, we are inclined to think that it was after Jesus' resurrection, because it is almost psychologically impossible to conceive that God made man would accept to undergo the extreme humiliation of crucifixion, which was considered, according to Deuteronomy 21:22-23 (an interpretation confirmed by Galatians 3:13), as a sign of the curse of the person hung on the wood. It was in order to have proof, according to their understanding at the time, that Jesus could not be the Christ, the Messiah announced by the prophecies of the Old Testament, that the Pharisees wanted Jesus to be crucified, even though Pilate had agreed to have him stoned. In the eyes of the majority of the

members of the Sanhedrin, crucifying Jesus allowed them to prove that they were right and that Jesus could not come in the name of God, since crucifixion is proof that God has cursed the crucified.

A number of people believe that Mary understood the divine nature of Jesus from the moment of the Annunciation, but the fact that she showed concern and anxiety during the three days when Jesus was lost in the Temple in Jerusalem indicates the opposite. Indeed, a 12-year-old child who is in reality God made man has nothing to fear when he spends three days without his parents, alone in Jerusalem. Mary, who surpasses all other humans in intelligence because of her Immaculate Conception (her intelligence is not laborious and prone to error like ours), understands this better than anyone. And if she had known his divine nature, she would not have needed to speak to him at the Wedding at Cana; a simple thought would have sufficed.

Poor style #6 and 7: As she walks away from the tomb, Mary speaks of Jesus as "a lamb, white and tender, a little lamb with curly golden hair."

611.8 "For thirty-two years they have been laying snares for my Child's life..." He was a milk-fed lamb, he was a little lamb with curly golden hair... He could barely say "Mama," take his first steps, or laugh with his little teeth between his clear coral lips when they came to slaughter him... March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611

Indecency No. 100: The Virgin Mary asks the young and beautiful women accompanying her to say that Jesus never looked at her in a sensual way.

Indecency No. 101: "my warm breast" from which "flowed

the milk flowed."

Indecency No. 102: Mary says that Jesus' senses were limited to the need for warmth and food, and that the baby Jesus would rest his little face and sleep on her warm breast.

Indecency No. 103: The Virgin Mary speaks of her breasts: "*my warm breast"* "my breast from which my love flowed as milk"

611.8 (...) In Heaven, he had the breast of the Father, and on Earth he had my breast. He never had a sensual look, and you, young and beautiful, can say so (...) The exercise of his senses was limited to the need for warmth and food, and he was full of love, yes, but for my warm breast to rest his little face and sleep like that, and for my breast from which my love flowed as milk... Oh! My Child! (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 104: Mary insults Jerusalem: "hyena," "vampire," "vulture."

611.7 Mary turns to look at the top of Calvary... (...) 611.8 (...) He asked nothing of you, my Jesus. No money, no jewels, no houses. He had a small, holy one, and he left it out of love for you, you hyenas. (...) And you, Jerusalem, you stripped him of his life. Are you sated and filled with his Blood and his Flesh? Or is that not enough for you? And you, hyena, after being a vampire and a vulture, do you want to feast on his Corpse (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 105: Mary curses the Jews who wanted her son dead.

611.11 (...) "They are criminals and they know they are (...) now they flee, they hide, they lock themselves away (...) To whom do they close their doors? To remorse, to punishment. It is useless: remorse is within you and will follow you forever. Punishment is not human. And locks and sticks, doors and bars are useless against it. It comes down from Heaven, from God, avenger of his Sacrificed One, and it penetrates beyond walls and doors, and marks you with its heavenly flame, marks you for the supernatural punishment that awaits you (...) you will be marked forever, the Cains of a God, marked as the opprobrium of the human race. Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Hateful disfigurement of the merciful face of the Virgin Mary:

Valtorta disfigures the merciful face of the Virgin Mary, to whom God has entrusted the entire order of Mercy. To attribute such feelings and words to Mary is offensive.

Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution Lumen Gentium, §62. Mary, Mother of Grace: "From the consent she gave by her faith on the day of the Annunciation and which she maintained under the cross in her steadfastness, Mary's motherhood in the economy of grace continues uninterrupted until the final consummation of all the elect."

Therefore, it is odious to put words of curse in Mary's mouth.

Theological Error No. 202 and Indecency No. 106: Mary insults the Jews who wanted her son dead by calling them "very cowardly hyenas," "creeping jackals."

611.11 (...) They are not real lions and panthers, they are very cowardly hyenas. They attack the defenseless lamb, but they fear the lion armed with spears and his authority. Do not fear these creeping jackals. Vision March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

The Virgin Mary committed no sin, and to utter these insults would have been a sin. On the contrary, Mary gave the most perfect example of love for one's enemies by continually embodying, even at the height of her pain, the most perfect gentleness. We are therefore faced with a serious doctrinal error. Mary is venerated as Mother of Mercy, Queen of Peace; her holiness is perfect. She accompanied Jesus to the Cross with heroic compassion, interior prayer, and silence.

The Gospels do not attribute to her any words of hatred or insult, even in the most extreme suffering, even in the depths of the dark night of faith. Insults such as "very cowardly hyenas" and "creeping jackals" cannot come from her immaculate heart, for these words are violent, contemptuous, and unworthy.

Through her Immaculate Conception, Mary is free from all hatred, resentment, or contempt, even toward those who participated in the Passion of Christ.

Furthermore, this barrage of insults that Maria Valtorta attributes to him contradicts the Christian attitude toward persecutors. Did not Jesus on the cross say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34)? Mary, perfectly united with the will of her Son, cannot in any way contradict this word of forgiveness. The Catholic faith teaches love for one's enemies; it does not encourage insulting them.

The fact that Maria Valtorta attributes to the Virgin Mary

hateful or violent words is sufficient proof that her visions do not come from God. Maria Valtorta's visions come from her natural mediumship or from demons or from a mixture of both sources.

To write that the Virgin Mary uttered such insults is to mock her dignity, her holiness, and the spirit of the Gospel.

It is not only theologically false, but also spiritually dangerous, because it could lead some people, when they are victims of injustice or violence, to justify hatred or hostility that is incompatible with Christianity.

Indecency No. 107: Mary says, "I am numb with pain."

611.11 (...) "It's true... I am numb with pain. And the clothes? I have nothing of Him! I would give my blood to have them..." Vision March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 108: Mary "truly drags herself along like a decrepit old woman."

611.13 – And so she arrives in the street where the Cenacle is located. It is time because she is exhausted and she is really dragging herself along like an old woman. And she says so. Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Italian: "una vecchia cadente." Other possible translations: "A decrepit old woman" or "an old woman in ruins."

Does such an insult come from Heaven? Is it necessary to be so vulgar to express complete exhaustion?

Indecency No. 109: Mary says that her cross may be heavier than her son's. As if Jesus did not suffer

from his mother's suffering.

611.13 (...) It seems to me that I have experienced all the pain in the world and that it is all on my shoulders, which are bending under the weight. An immaterial cross, but so heavy! Made of stone. Perhaps even heavier than that of my Jesus. For I carry mine and his with the memory of his anguish and the reality of mine (...). Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 110: Mary says she would have the right to be cruel to Judas.

611.13 (...) John, swear to me that you will look for him [Judas] and that you will not be cruel to him. I am not cruel, even though I have the right to be... Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

To imagine such feelings in the Virgin Mary is deeply offensive.

Indecency No. 111: Mary apologizes to Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus for her insults in the tomb.

611.13 (…) Joseph of Arimathea, I thank you, and you too, Nicodemus... My heart bows down at your weary feet because of the long journey you have made for Him... for the last honors rendered to Him... I have only my heart to give you... and I give it to you, loyal friends of my Son... and... and forgive the words that a pierced mother spoke to you at the tomb..." Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 112: Joseph of Arimathea said to the Virgin: "Be good." Nicodemus said to her: "Forgive."

611.13 (...) "Oh! Holy One! You, forgive!" said Nicodemus. "Be good now. Rest in your Faith. We will come tomorrow," added Joseph. Vision of March 28, 1945. T. 9ch31. T10ch611.

When a mother has just lost her son in such atrocious circumstances, you do not say to her, "Forgive," or "be good."

Indecency No. 113: Mary asks that the door of the Cenacle be opened so that she may breathe in the scent of her child's body, feel "the fragrance of his youthful body."

Indecency No. 114: Nicodemus, Joseph, John, or the holy women say to Mary, "You are sick."

Indecency No. 114: Mary replies, "Yes, sick."

611.15 – "Come, Marie." "Yes, Mother, come." "No. Open (...) Open this door! You cannot close it on a mother, on a mother who seeks to breathe in the scent of her child's breath, of his body. (...) That scent of flesh is mine! (...) Let me smell it one more time." (...) "You are ill." "Yes, sick. But it's because I have the sight of his Blood in my eyes and the smell of his Body covered with wounds in my nose. Because I see the table where he leaned, alive and well, because I smell the fragrance of his youthful body (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Indecency No. 115: Mary wants to burn her lips by kissing the traces of Jesus' feet and hands

left in the Upper Room, on the table, on his seat. She searches for a hair of Jesus.

611.15 (...) I will search on the floor, on the table, on his seat, for the traces of his feet and hands. And I will kiss them, I will kiss them until my lips are consumed. I will search... I will search... Perhaps I will find a hair from his blond head, a hair that is not covered in blood (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

These words are delusional. They also contradict the previous lines, in which Mary expresses her firm belief in the imminent resurrection of Jesus: in this case, kissing the footprints and handprints and searching for a hair no longer makes sense, since she will be reunited with Jesus in the flesh, and she will then be able to ask him for a lock of his hair if she wishes.

Regarding Jesus' "blond head" and sapphire-blue eyes: if this had been the case, Judas would have used this distinguishing feature to facilitate his arrest in Gethsemane instead of saying, "The one I kiss is the one; arrest him" (Matthew 26:48). This verse proves that it was not easy to distinguish Jesus from the other apostles, so Jesus was not blond with blue eyes.

Blond-haired, blue-eyed people were very rare in Jerusalem 2,000 years ago.

Maria Valtorta also sees Saint John as blond, but he is 20 years old and easily distinguishable from a 30-year-old man, if only by his beard. In fact, this is how Maria Valtorta describes Saint John during his first encounter with Jesus (chap. 47.2 New Edition): "John (...) his charming youthful face could be that of a young girl. He looks about twenty years old, and on his rosy cheeks there is nothing but a blond down that looks like a golden veil."

Indecency No. 116: Mary tells Saint John that he is no longer her son because he refuses to open the door of the cenacle to her, and in the next second she asks him for forgiveness.

611.15 (...) John? John? Listen to me. I am your mother: He made me so. He! You owe me obedience. Open up! I love you, John. I have always loved you because you loved him. I will love you even more. But open up. Open, I tell you! You don't want to? You don't want to? Ah! So I have no son anymore!? Jesus never refused me anything because he was my son. You refuse. You are not my son. You do not understand my pain... Oh! John, forgive me... forgive me... Open up... Don't cry... Open up... (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

This false vision accuses Mary of acting impulsively, maliciously, and unreasonably.

Indecency No. 117: Mary asks Jesus for a miracle so that the door of the Cenacle will be opened to her. She clenches her fists and bangs on the door.

611.15 (...) Oh, Jesus!... Jesus!... Listen to me... May your spirit work a miracle! Open this door that no one will open for your poor Mother! Jesus! Jesus!" Mary clenches her fists and pounds on the tightly closed door. Her anguish is at its peak. She finally turns pale, murmuring, "Oh, my Jesus! I'm coming! I'm coming!" She collapses, powerless, into the arms of the women who are crying. They support her to prevent her from falling at the foot of the door and carry her into the room opposite. Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

Another disrespectful false vision: Mary punches the door with her clenched fists and collapses.

Indecency No. 118: Mary "comes to" and then "cries uncontrollably."

612.1 – Mary, rescued by the weeping women, comes to herself. She cries with no strength left except to cry incessantly. It really seems that her life must flow away and be consumed entirely in these tears. Vision March 29, 1945. T9ch32. T10ch612.

All the hysterical or psychotic words and actions that Maria Valtorta attributes to the Virgin Mary are not only deeply disrespectful and blasphemous, but they contradict the words that the same Virgin Mary spoke about the imminent resurrection of her Son. Mary even reproached those who were with her in the tomb for not believing it.

Indecency No. 119: Mary insults John, Martha, Mary of Alpheus, and Mary of Cleophas as "useless and inert servants" and orders them to leave. They obey
"so as not to upset her further."

Indecency No. 120: Mary moans and makes noise.

612.4 (...) Get out! Leave! Even seeing you is painful for me! (...) You couldn't even get a less cruel form of torture. Useless, inert servants of your King, get out!" She is terrible in her rage. Standing stiffly (...) with her imperious eyes, her arm (...) pointing to the door. She commands like a queen (...) Everyone leaves without reacting so as not to excite her further and sits outside the closed door to listen to her moans and any noise she may make. Vision of Thursday, March 29, 1945. T9ch32. T10ch612.

According to Valtorta, everyone understood that the Virgin Mary was delirious and losing control of herself.

Indecency No. 121: Mary tells God in a prayer that she wanted her son to suffer less, so she did not accept what God had allowed and planned from all eternity.

Indecency No. 122: Mary says she has become "proud and wicked" and asks God to forgive her "sin of proud hardness."

612.4 (…) "Father, Father, forgive me! I am becoming proud and wicked. But you see: what I say is true. (...) Of all the people who followed him, not even a handful could be gathered together, not to save him—he had to die to redeem us—but to allow him to die without such torture. They remained in the shadows or fled... My heart rebels at such cowardice. I am the Mother. Because of this, forgive my sin of proud hardness..." Vision March 29, 1945. T9ch32. T10ch612.

It is impossible that the Virgin Mary would say such a prayer, for her union with her son's will was perfect, and it was God who, from all eternity, decided to allow this ocean of suffering. God alone determined to the millimeter the measure of suffering that He would allow creatures to inflict on Jesus. The true Virgin Mary never claimed to know better than her Son (Jesus is true God and true man) the amount of suffering that it was fitting for Him to suffer.

Indecency No. 123: Mary says that Jesus no longer hears her name when she pronounces it because he is dead.

612.7 (...) To whom do I say your Name? Nothing answers my cry. Even if I shouted until I split the stone that seals your

tomb, you would not hear it because you are dead. Can you no longer hear your Mother? (...) Undated vision. T9ch33. T10ch612.

Valtorta contradicts herself, since she states elsewhere that the Virgin Mary knew, before the Passion, the divine nature of Jesus, but if Jesus is God, he is everywhere and hears Mary when she speaks to him.

Furthermore, in The Communion of Saints, the souls of the deceased, whatever their fate in the afterlife (paradise, purgatory, hell), hear or are informed by God of the prayers and thoughts addressed to them and of events that concern them. Judaism in the Hellenistic period (4th–1st century BC) attests to the belief in the individual survival of the human soul.

Indecency No. 124: Mary regrets once again that she was not locked in the tomb.

Indecency No. 125: While sleeping, the infant Jesus made a gesture of suckling his mother's breast: this is what Mary thinks about on Good Friday evening.

Indecency No. 126: Jesus caressed his mother's breast while suckling.

Indecency No. 127: Mary says, "Near your funeral bed, to arrange the swaddling clothes as I did in the past and change them."

612.10 – Jesus, I cannot stay here alone while you are there alone (...) Why did they not leave me in your tomb? I would have sat near your cold bed, holding one of your hands in mine, to make you feel that

I was close to you... (...) You can't feel anything anymore. You're dead! (...) Do you want me to tell you how you smiled in your sleep and how, surely remembering your mother's milk, you made sucking motions? (...) You woke up and opened your little eyes and laughed (...) How you happily stretched out your little hands, eager for me to pick you up, and how, with a soft little cry (...) you asked for your food? Oh! How happy I was when you latched onto my breast and I felt the smooth warmth of your cheeks, the caress of your little hands on my breast! (...) I would have felt less sad if I had been near your funeral bed, to arrange your swaddling clothes as I used to and change them (...) Undated vision. T9ch33. T10ch612.

Indecency No. 128: Marie says: "*I'm crazy." "I'm delirious." "I'm not delirious." "I'm not crazy."*

612.11 (...) I'm crazy! Jesus is dead? I'm delirious. Jesus can't die! (...) He is God. God doesn't die. (...) I'm not delirious, no. I'm not crazy. No. If I were! I would suffer less! He is dead (...) Vision without date. T9ch33. T10ch612.

Note No. 1: Mary breastfed longer than usual because of poverty.

Vulgarity No. 1: Marie says about breastfeeding Jesus: "I was your little goat."

612.16 (...) in our flight to Egypt we had lost so much (...) I gave you milk beyond the usual time so that you would not feel the lack of food. Until we had the little goat, I was your little goat, child of your mother. You already had so many teeth and you bit... Oh, what joy to see you laughing as you played as a child! ... (...) You, who took your first little steps (...) Oh, Father, help me.

Jesus doesn't hear me! (...) Vision without date. T9ch33. T10ch612.

This is childishness that demeans the Virgin Mary.

Indecency No. 129: Mary says to God: "You shouldn't have... You shouldn't have..."

612.17 (...) But You, who cursed Cain and took vengeance on him, did not intervene for my Abel, already bleeding from his Cains, and You allowed the final outrage! You crushed his heart by abandoning him, and You allowed a man to strip him naked, so that I could see him and be crushed. (...) You should not have... You should not have... Vision without date. T9ch33. T10ch612.

In reality, Mary never made such accusations against God, she never reproached God in this way. She cooperated with her son with all her soul for the redemption of humanity, accepting perfectly everything that God's Will had allowed.

Indecency No. 130: Mary "is no longer mistress of herself."

612.20 (...) Mary sits down because she is no longer in control of herself (...) Mary lets out a cry of painful love and stretches out her arms. (...) March 29, 1947. T9ch33 T10ch612.

Indecency No. 131 Mary Magdalene mentions her "orgies of love."

612.21 (...) the alabaster and incense I used for my orgies of love (...) a profane cult of the senses and the flesh (...) Saturday, March 29, 1947. T9ch33. T10ch612.

On such an oc , it is impossible to rule out the possibility that Marie-Madeleine might have mentioned such things.

Madeleine would mention such things.

Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger's secretary denounced the "subtly sensual" atmosphere of "The Gospel According to John as Revealed to Me" in his 1985 letter.

Indecency No. 132: "The Mother could give Him only her tears."

612.27 (...) "Do you see, Mother? Everyone is giving to the King of Heaven and Earth." [Valeria, a pagan woman, came to offer balms from Rome, incense, essences, and precious resins, for she knew the Jewish customs regarding the dead.] "Yes," said Mary. "Everyone. And the Mother could give Him only her tears." March 29, 1947. T9ch33. T10ch612.

This sentence implies that the Virgin Mary did not understand her role with her son during the Passion. This is entirely false. In addition, it is also false to imagine the Virgin Mary spending her time talking. Her immense suffering and the dark night of faith she probably went through make the endless speeches that Maria Valtorta attributes to her psychologically impossible.

Theological Error No. 106: Valtorta changes John 1:35-51: John and Andrew or John and James? St. James present or in prison?

47.1 - I see Jesus (...) returning (...) to the place where he was baptized (...) He comes across a group of men (...) Among them, I see John and James. 47.2 - John, the first to see Jesus, (...) begins to (...) join Jesus. James follows him more slowly. The others pay little attention (...) When John reaches Jesus (...) he cries out, "Lamb of God,

who takes away the sins of the world!" Jesus turns around (…)
'Who are you looking for?' Jesus asks.
– You, Master.
– How do you know I am the teacher?
– John the Baptist told me.
– Then why do you call me Lamb?
– Because I heard him call you that one day when you passed by, more than a month ago (...)
– But who are you?
– I am John, son of Zebedee, and he is my brother James (...) the coming of the Messiah. It is you. John said so (...) I say to you (...) give us peace (...)
– Where is John?
– Herod had him arrested. He is in prison in Machaerus. His most faithful followers tried to rescue him, but it was impossible. We have just come from there.
47.3 - Let us come with you, Master. Show us where you live (...)
– Come, let us walk. I will instruct you along the way.
Friday, February 25, 1944. T2ch7. T1ch47.

In the true Gospel, St. John the Baptist is present when John and Andrew go to speak to Jesus Christ.
In Valtorta, St. John the Baptist is in prison, Jesus does not know what has become of him, and it is John and James who meet Jesus first.

Let us reread the Gospel according to St. John, chapter 1, to see how much Maria Valtorta distorts it: (...) 24Now those who had been sent to him were Pharisees. 25And they questioned him and said to him, "Why then are you baptizing, if you are not the Christ, nor Elijah, nor the Prophet?"

26 John answered them, "I baptize with water, but among you there is one whom you do not know,
27 He is the one who comes after me, and I am not worthy to

untie his sandal strap." [28] This took place in Bethany, across the Jordan, where John was baptizing.

[29] The next day John saw Jesus coming toward him and said, "Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world! [30] This is the one I meant when I said, 'A man who comes after me has surpassed me because he was before me.'" ([31]) I did not know him, but I came baptizing with water so that he might be revealed to Israel." ([32]) And John testified, saying, "I saw the Spirit descend from heaven like a dove, and it rested on him. ([33]) And I did not know him, but he who sent me to baptize with water said to me, 'The one on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit. ([34]) And I have seen and have testified that this is the Son of God."

[35] The next day, John was still there with two of his disciples. [36] When he saw Jesus passing by, he said, "Look, there is the Lamb of God." [37] The two disciples heard him say this, and they followed Jesus. [38]Jesus turned around and saw them following him and said to them, "What are you looking for?" They answered him, "Rabbi, which means Teacher, where are you staying?" ([39]) He said to them, "Come and see." They went and saw where he was staying, and they remained with him that day. It was about the tenth hour.

[40]Now Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, was one of the two who had heard John's words and had followed Jesus.
[41] He first found his brother Simon and said to him, "We have found the Messiah, which is translated Christ."

[42] And he brought him to Jesus. Jesus, looking at him, said, "You are Simon, son of John; you will be called Cephas, which means Peter." [43] The next day, Jesus decided to go to Galilee. And

he found Philip.

44 And Jesus said to him, "Follow me." Philip was from Bethsaida, the town of Andrew and Peter. (45) Philip found Nathanael and said to him, "We have found the one Moses wrote about in the Law, and about whom the prophets also wrote—Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." (46) Nathanael replied, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" Philip said to him, "Come and see."

47 Jesus saw Nathanael coming toward him and said of him, "Here is a true Israelite, in whom there is no deceit." (48) Nathanael said to him, "How do you know me?" Jesus answered and said to him, "Before Philip called you, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you." (49) Nathanael answered him, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are the King of Israel."

50 Jesus answered him, "Because I said to you, 'I saw you under the fig tree,' you believe. You will see greater things than these." 51 And he added, "Truly, truly, I say to you, you will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."

Theological Error No. 107: St. John speaks to Jesus about Simon VS John 1:41-42 Andrew brings Peter to Jesus.

49.3 (...) [Jesus:] "You said you were looking for me..." [John:] "Yes. To tell you that my friends want to know you (...) [Jesus:] "So you have been a good herald of the Word?" [John:] "But James, too, Master spoke of You in a way... convincingly." (...) "Oh! Simon can rest easy, he is frank like no other." [Jesus:] "That is how I like him and how I want to see everyone." [John:] "He has so much to tell you, Simon." (...)
October 13, 1944, T2ch10 T1ch49.

Theological Error No. 108: When Jesus first met St. Peter, he did not say to him, "You are Simon, son of John, you <u>will be called</u> Cephas, which means Peter."

Theological Error No. 203: Does Jesus need Peter for support? A theological dependency?

49.7 - Jesus went out to the little square. At the door stood John and James with Peter and Andrew (...) Simon, you wanted to see me? Here I am (...) For now, He [God] asks this of you: practice justice, love mercy, apply yourself totally to following your God. Strive to do this, and Simon's past will be erased, and <u>you will become</u> a new man, a friend of God and of His Christ. No longer Simon, but Cephas, the solid rock on which I rest." (...) October 13, 1944, T2ch10 T1ch49.

Valtorta distorts one of the most famous verses of the Gospels, replacing it with a heterodox statement, because Jesus does not lean on St. Peter. The Church of Jesus Christ is founded on Peter, but Jesus is God and needs nothing and no one; he does not need support, he does not lean on Peter:

1 Colossians *[15]He is the image of the invisible God, born before all creatures [16]for in him all things were created, those in heaven and those on earth, the visible and the invisible, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers, all things were created through him and for him. ([17]) He is before all things, and in him all things hold together.*

[18] He is the head of the body of the Church, he who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, so that in all things he might have the first place.

By his own free choice, God delegated part of his authority to Peter. But to suggest that Jesus was dependent on Peter is theologically problematic and inaccurate. It is Peter who will rely on Jesus to accomplish his mission, not the other way around.

Theological Error No. 109 and Indecency No. 133: St. John lied to highlight Andrew, who was too shy to bring his brother Peter to Jesus.

49.10 - Who among those who do something for me knows how to imitate John and does not proclaim himself an incomparable apostle? They do not consider that their success comes from a combination of things, that it is not only a matter of holiness, but also of human audacity, luck, and the fact of being close to others who are less bold or less fortunate, but perhaps holier than themselves. Catechesis of October 14, 1944, T2ch10 T1ch49.

In another passage from "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," 464.18, Jesus repeats the Gospel of St. John without realizing that it contradicts Valtorta's version: *Read the first chapter of his Gospel where he recounts his encounter with Me: "John the Baptist was again with two of his disciples... The two disciples, having heard these words... Andrew, brother of Simon Peter, was one of the two who had heard John's words and had followed Jesus. The first one Andrew met...[2]" He does not name himself, but instead hides behind Andrew, whom he brings into the spotlight. July 30, 1946, "The Gospel as Revealed to Me"*
464.18. Cf. René Gounon, *Maria Valtorta l'Évangile dévoyé, des Visions et Messages qui ne peuvent venir de Dieu.* https://sosdiscernement.org/ website of Father Dominique Auzenet.

It is unlikely that St. John lied to highlight Andrew, who would have been too shy to bring his brother Peter to Jesus, since Andrew and Peter were brothers. It is not credible that Andrew, out of shyness, refused to tell Peter about Jesus.

On the other hand, Valtorta accuses St. John of lying in his account of the calling of the first disciples. This is a seriously disrespectful accusation against St. John.

Theological Error No. 110: The sins of the flesh are the devil's main sins.

Do not be surprised if a person appears to you with the repulsive appearance of a dirty and impure animal, a monster swollen with ferment, with the leaven of lust. This is because this poor creature is a dunghill of numerous vices and sins, but the sins of the flesh are the principal ones in him. January 26, 1945, 8 p.m. Notebooks from 1945 to 1950.

The devil being a pure spirit, he cannot commit sins of the flesh.

Theological Error No. 111: Jesus claims that the use of the terms "uncle" and "aunt" is intended to put an end to attacks against Mary's perpetual virginity.

100.10 – Jesus then said: (...) 100.12 – And again, for the quibblers, I say that I used the terms "uncle" and "aunt," which do not exist in the languages of Palestine, to clarify and put an end to a disrespectful question about my status as the Only Son of Mary and about my Mother's virginity (...) Wednesday, February 7, 1945. T2ch65. T2ch100.

If it were really Jesus, he could at least have used the excellent arguments of Catholic exegetes to respond to those who claim that Joseph and Mary had several children. Ridiculing himself by using anachronistic words and insulting people was of no use. In Aramaic or Hebrew, the word "cousin" does not exist.

Theological Error No. 112: Adam suffered the same fate as Lucifer and Judas.

Never be presumptuous (...) If tomorrow you raise your forehead against your God, driven by the pride of feeling so loved, what happened to Lucifer, Adam, and Judas will happen to you; with nothing but thoughts devoid of grace in your thunderstruck head, you would go (...) down dark paths, filled (...) with the stench of Satan, that perpetual tempter of man who, if he does not watch carefully, becomes his prey, then a soul dead to grace, a sure inhabitant of the kingdom that is not heaven. Cahiers 1945-1950 p.502.

In other passages, Jesus says that Adam is saved, so Jesus contradicts himself. It seems to me that there is a consensus among the Church Fathers that Adam and Eve are saved.

Theological Error No. 113: Judas pronounces the name of God as Yahweh, which Jews never did.

78.2 (…) "But are you not the King promised to Israel? It is time for the world to greet you as such, and this had to happen first here, in my city, in my house. I worship you with this title. Out of love for me and out of respect for your name as Messiah, Christ, King, which the prophets gave you by order of Yahweh January 14, 1945. T2ch42. T1ch78.

The maria-valtorta website specifies: "Yahweh in the original [Italian] text. Judas pronounces Jehovah in the short manner of the Judeans." This is an error; it was forbidden to pronounce the name of God. The so-called variations in the pronunciation of the sacred name of God are false science, charlatanism.

Theological Error No. 114: Jesus asks Judas not to be an apostle.

78.3 (...) Oh, Judas, what do you expect from Me in terms of earthly power? (...) Why do you want to follow Me if you don't want to be what I want you to be? Go away, Judas! Don't harm yourself or Me... Go. It's better for you. You're not the right person for this job... It is too much for you. In you there is pride, greed, and with its three branches, the spirit of domination (...) Judas: I do not hate you. I do not curse you. I only say to you, and it is with the pain of not being able to change someone I love, I only say to you: go your way, make a place for yourself in the world since that is what you want, but do not stay with me.

The problem with such a statement is the impression it gives that Jesus did not call Judas to be one of the apostles, but that Judas imposed his will on him:

Gospel of Matthew 10. [1] Then he called his twelve disciples and gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out and to heal every disease and every infirmity. [2] Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: the first, Simon, and I called him Peter; then Andrew his brother, and James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, (3) Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew the tax collector, James, son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, (4) Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him. (5) These are the

twelve whom Jesus sent out after giving them instructions (...)

Theological Error No. 115: "God is Love made God."

89.3 (...) Simon: "But what is God?" Jesus: "God is Perfection that cannot be attained (...) complete Beauty (...) infinite Power (...) incomprehensible Essence (...) unsurpassable Goodness (...) indestructible Compassion (...) immeasurable Wisdom. God is Love become God. He is Love! He is Love! (...) when you understand what Love become God is (...)
January 27, 1945. T2ch54. T2ch89.

"The expression indicates a process of deification of a pre-existing love" (Don Guillaume Chevallier). It is impossible to "become God." God is the being who exists by himself from all eternity. He is love in essence and eternally. It makes no sense to say that love became God. Love cannot "become God." God is love eternally; He does not become God. Nothing changes in God; God is perfect. To say that love became God implies that love pre-exists God, which is a serious theological error.

Indecency No. 134: Infantilization of Jesus

89.6 (...) Mary turns abruptly (...) "Oh! My Son (...) you are dripping with sweat like a sponge (...) Are you thirsty? (...) "Thirsty for your kiss, Mom, for your caresses. Let me stay like this, with my head on your shoulder, like when I was little... Oh! Mother! How I miss you!"
89.8 (...) How sweet is the house! And your caress!

Let me sleep like this, with my head on your lap. I am so tired. I am still your little child..." And Jesus falls asleep, tired and exhausted, sitting on the mat, his head on his mother's breast, who, very happy, caresses his hair.
January 27, 1945. T2ch54. T2ch89.

At age 30, Jesus is said to have been emotionally attached to his early childhood. Valtorta depicts Jesus as eager for his mother's kisses and caresses. This is a pathological view of the emotional life of a mature man. The Lion of the tribe of Judah, in the privacy of his family home, aspires to nothing more than caresses, kisses, and to do what he did when he was a small child. Maria Valtorta projects this pathology of emotional and sensual infantilism onto the Virgin Mary; one need only read the horrible visions in the Holy Sepulcher, where the Virgin Mary is depicted as constantly reminiscing about moments with Jesus when he was a baby.

The majority of mothers do not other extraordinary moments of communion and love with their children than when they are babies? Is early childhood the ultimate paradise of maternal happiness?

The communion of souls between Jesus and his mother is belittled and ridiculed by Maria Valtorta. This infantilization of their emotions is wrong and insidiously degrading to them.

It is conceivable that Jesus likes to take Mary in his arms, hold her close to him, and keep her there for long moments: adults do this and find much joy and rest in it. It is not the need for tenderness and intimacy with his mother that is problematic.

The problem is that Valtorta fails to understand that neither Jesus nor Mary remained stuck in the memories of their early childhood. If we were to caricature slightly, we could see Jesus asking his

mother to bring out his old toys so they can play a game he used to play when he was 4 years old. I hope this image will help the reader understand what is wrong with these lines by Maria Valtorta. Can we imagine such a great man in the history of humanity acting in this way? Must mysticism be a kind of romantic novel?

Theological Error No. 116: *Mother, help me (...) I alone cannot [sanctify men]*

89.8 (...) I beg you to have mercy on those who will come tomorrow (...) they are not perfect. You, Mistress of virtue... oh! Mother, help me to make them good... I want to save them all..." (...) "My Son! What more can your poor Mother do than You?" "Sanctify them... Your virtue sanctifies. I brought them to you on purpose, Mother... one day, I will say to you, 'Come,' because then it will be urgent to sanctify souls, so that I may find in them the will to be redeemed. And I alone cannot do it... Your silence will be as effective as my words. Your purity will help my power. Your presence will drive Satan away... and your Son, Mother, will find strength in knowing that you are close by (...)
January 27, 1945. T2ch54. T2ch89.

Jesus cannot sanctify souls without Mary. In reality, God can very well sanctify souls without the Virgin Mary, and the angelic purity of the mother of Jesus adds nothing to the power of God, but God has decided to pass through Mary.

The holy Pope Paul VI proclaimed the universal motherhood of the Virgin Mary at the Second Vatican Council, which means that no grace comes to a soul without passing through Mary. This is her true greatness, but to insinuate that Jesus could not do without Mary is simply stupid; it is a twisted way of glorifying Mary.

Indecency No. 135: Jesus curses a Pharisee and his fields, his flocks, and his vineyards

Jesus goes to Doras, a very wicked landowner, to buy back Jonah, a slave.

109.6 Doras is worse than a hyena." (...) "But this man is a wild beast!" exclaims Matthew. "No. He has no soul," says Jesus.
109.9 (...) Doras comes out. He is an old man with the harsh features of a ravenous old bird. He has an ironic look and a snake-like mouth that forms a false smile (...)
Doras (...) the opulence of his house, the interior of which is truly sumptuous. Sumptuous and cold.
(...) Jesus is much taller than Doras and towers over him, imposing in his purple robe, next to the Pharisee, who is small, slightly stooped, and parchment-like, in his robe with its impressive length and abundance of fringes. (...) He laughs his cruel laugh. Jesus, with his arms crossed, pierces him with his increasingly severe gaze. (…) "Liar!" "Liar, me
? I swear by Yahweh!" "Perjurer!" "I, a perjurer? I who am the most faithful among the faithful? Watch your words!" "Murderer!" Jesus raised his voice even higher, and his last word was like thunder. (...) Jesus' face was unbearable in its severity. His eyes seemed to emit phosphorescent rays. (...) "In my house, I am the only one in command. Get out, you vile Galilean."
"I will leave after cursing you with your fields, your flocks, and your vineyards for this year and the years to come."
"No, not that! Yes, it's true. Jonah is sick, but he is being cared for, well cared for. Take back your curse!"
109.11 – "Where is Jonah? Let a servant take me to him at once. I have paid him, and since he is a commodity to you, a machine, I regard him as such. Since I have paid for him, I demand him." (…) Jesus (…) follows the servants (…) They enter Jonah's hovel. He has become a

skeleton. He is gasping for breath, half naked, racked by fever on a bed of reeds (...) "Jonah! My friend! I have come to get you! (...) You will not die here. I will take you to my house." (...) Jesus is all love (...) Joy seems to revive Jonah. 109.12 (...) "This bed is mine! I sold you the servant, not the bed." Without saying a word, Jesus throws the purse at his feet. Doras picks it up and empties it. "Forty pieces of silver and five didrachmas. That's not much!"
Jesus stares at the greedy and repulsive pimp. It is an indescribable scene. He says nothing.
"At least tell me you'll take back your curse!"
Jesus glares at him again and replies briefly: "I leave you to the God of Sinai."
And standing very straight, he withdrew to the side of the rustic litter, carried carefully by Peter and Andrew.
Doras, seeing that all is useless, that condemnation is certain, cries out: "We will meet again, Jesus! Oh! I will have you between my nails! I will wage war against you to the death. Take this shadow of a man away. He is no longer of any use to me. It will save me the cost of burial. Go, go, accursed Satan! But I will set the whole Sanhedrin against you. Satan! Satan!" Vision February 15, 1945. T2ch76. T2ch109.

This episode distorts the merciful nature of Jesus. In the Gospel, only a fig tree was cursed by Jesus. He prophesied the damnation of the Pharisees, "you will die in your sins" (John 8:21), but it seems to us that this episode with Doras does not come from God and never happened. It is a bit like if, alongside the episode of the adulterous woman (John 8:3-11), there had been another episode where Jesus, this time, had actually stoned a guilty and wicked woman: this contradicts the spirit of the Gospel.

Theological Error No. 117: ″I-We, God One and Triune."

126.3 (...) The Father said to me: (...) nothing unclean can enter this Paradise, for in this place, I-We, the Triune God, have our throne. And only holiness can be found in his presence. Saturday, March 10, 1945. T2ch93. T2ch126.

The Holy Trinity is one of the great mysteries of our religion, and we have no right to talk about it carelessly or express ourselves in any way we please. If it were really Jesus speaking, he would have used the language of Catholic theology and would not have made himself ridiculous with grotesque gibberish that shows disrespect for this divine mystery.

Theological Error No. 118: God does not forgive those who become murderers "out of ambition or because they seek the esteem of men."

126.6 (...) If God can forgive someone who becomes a murderer in the heat of passion, He does not forgive someone who becomes a murderer out of ambition or because he seeks the esteem of men. Saturday, March 10, 1945. T2ch93. T2ch126.

This is a serious error against God's mercy, for God forgives as long as the person regrets his act and is willing to make amends in accordance with the customs and just laws of the society where the guilty party committed his crime.

Theological Error No. 119: Jesus invents a curse for mistreating a slave.

126.9 (...) He is eternally cursed who inflicts on him a treatment he would not apply to his ox. " Jesus' eyes flash, and he thunders. Everyone looks at him

in surprise, for he had been speaking calmly. "Cursed be he! (...) Saturday, March 10, 1945. T2ch93. T2ch126.

One of the sins that cry out to Heaven is not paying a worker his wages. It is true that mistreating another person is a mortal sin, but Jesus did not curse such acts during his life on earth. "The Gospel as it was revealed to me" disfigures Jesus and distorts Catholic morality once again.

Theological Error No. 120: St. John the Baptist "saw the Spirit descend upon the Word."

He descended upon Jesus as man, but not upon the Word, for the Holy Spirit is already one God with the Word and the Father. Where Jesus is present, the Holy Trinity is present, for Jesus is God, and in God there are three Persons.

80.8 (...) Jesus continues: (...) I was called "the Lamb of God" by the one who, holy and prophet, saw the Truth and saw the Spirit descend upon the Word and anoint him with his chrism of love while the voice of the Father filled the heavens with the sound of his words, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." January 17, 1945. T2ch44. T2ch80.

The error is the same as when Jesus said, "The Father has entered into me," because the Three Divine Persons are in the same place; they are never separated, that is, they are ONE in the one Divinity. Since God is ONE, UNIQUE, and each Person is God, no Person can "enter" or "descend" upon another Person of the Holy Trinity. Valtorta should have written that the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus as a man. For the Spirit, being already in the Word, cannot descend "upon" the Word= , the Son= , the second Person of the Holy Trinity. The

Word is eternal, but the humanity to which the Word was united was created at the Incarnation. When Jesus said to Mary Magdalene, "I am going to my God, to my Father," he is speaking as a man; as God, the Father is in Jesus: "the Father is in me and I am in the Father," and the divinity of Jesus does not ascend, it does not descend. God is present everywhere, all the time. God transcends space and time. God is omnipresent.

Theological Error #121: Jesus kills Doras while saying that it was God the Father who killed him.

Theological Error #122: Jesus says, "The Father has entered into me."

Theological Error No. 123: "It is not permissible to attack God. He takes vengeance upon Himself."

126.10 (...) In the background (...) half hidden (...) Doras appears (...) "Are you talking to me? Is what you're saying meant for me?"
"For you, yes. Get out of my house.
"I'm leaving. But soon we'll settle the score, don't doubt it."
"Soon? Right now. The God of Sinai, I told you, is waiting for you."
"You too, evil one, who brought misfortune and the harmful animals of the earth upon me. We will meet again. And it will be my joy."
"Yes. And you will not want to see me again, for I will judge you."
"Ah! Ah! Damn..." He stumbles, murmurs, and falls.
"He is dead!" cries the servant. "The master is dead! Blessed be you, Messiah, our avenger!"
"No, not me. God, the Eternal Lord (...)
"But he died by your will?" asks Peter.

"No, but the Father has entered into me... It is a mystery that you cannot understand. Know only that it is not permitted to attack God. He avenges himself." "But could you not then tell the Father to put to death all those who hate you?"
"Shut up! You don't know what spirit you're in! I am Mercy, not Vengeance."
Saturday, March 10, 1945. T2ch93. T2ch126.

(Problem reported by Father Guillaume Chevallier.)

Response to the error: "the Father entered into me": the Father cannot "enter" into Jesus because the Father is wholly, at all times, in the Son; the Father is wholly, at all times, in the Holy Spirit; the Son is wholly, at all times, in the Father; the Son is wholly, at all times, in the Holy Spirit. the Holy Spirit is wholly, at all times, in the Father, the Holy Spirit is wholly, at all times, in the Son. This is what Catholic theology calls the mutual indwelling of the divine Persons.

The Three Divine Persons are never separated, so the Father never leaves Jesus and never returns to Jesus; the Three are ONE in the one Divinity. The Son is always in the Father and, conversely, the Word is necessarily united with God; the Holy Spirit dwells and lives in God. The three divine Persons are one God. In the three Persons there is one and the same divine substance.

The Father is what the Son is, the Father and the Son are what the Holy Spirit is, that is to say: by nature, there is only one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who act as one according to the principle that everything in God is one. The works of the Trinity are inseparable and shared; no person acts before or after another, or without another. See the thematic index of the book we recommend everyone to buy: Heinrich Denzinger, *Symbols and Definitions of the Catholic Faith,* Paris, Éditions

du Cerf, 1st edition 1996.

These verses relate to the mutual indwelling of the divine Persons:

John 5 [19] "Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing; for whatever the Father does, the Son does likewise.
John 6 [44] No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him, and I will raise him up on the last day. (...) [57] As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me.
John 8 [16]And if I judge, my judgment is true, because I am not alone, but I and the Father who sent me.
John 10 [38] (...) believe my works, that you may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I am in the Father."
John 14 [8]Philip said to him, "Lord, show us the Father, and that will be enough for us." [9]Jesus answered him, "Have I been with you so long, and you still do not know me, Philip? Whoever has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, 'Show us the Father'? ([10]) Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me? The words I say to you I do not speak on my own; the Father who dwells in me does his works. ([11]) Believe me when I say that I am in the Father and the Father is in me.
John 16 [15] All that the Father has is mine. That is why I said that he will receive what is mine and will tell you about it. [32] (...) I am not alone, because the Father is with me.

Response to "God takes revenge":

Maria Valtorta presents Jesus as being overcome by human anger on several occasions. We find this idea of vengeance in Deuteronomy 32:35: *"Vengeance is mine, I will repay,"* but Jesus is best known for saying, "Love one another."

your enemies and pray for those who persecute you” (Mt 5:44) and “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do” (Lk 23:34). God is not a pagan god carried away by human anger. God’s justice is not vindictive but restorative, aimed at conversion. A saint said that if hell did not exist, there would not be a single saint; no doubt because before loving with pure love, every saint begins with servile fear or passes through it, during attacks from our three enemies: the flesh, the world, and Satan. God allows evil in order to bring about a greater good, not to "take revenge." Such a statement risks distorting the image of God into a vengeful being, incompatible with the Catholic faith.

Theological Error No. 124: Contradiction of Jesus: Did Doras die of anger (604.6) or was he killed by God (126.10)?

Theological Error No. 125: God waits for the wicked "on the other side to strike them down."

604.6 (...) Why are you afraid that I will dethrone you (...) The Lord knows when to say "Enough," which will cause you to fall, struck by lightning... "Like Doras, huh?" "He died of anger, not by lightning from Heaven. God was waiting for him on the other side to strike him down." From Thursday, March 22 to Sunday, March 25, 1945. T9ch22. T10ch604.

Maria Valtorta once again presents us with a Jesus who contradicts himself, proof that this is not Jesus. Refer to No. 126.10 and the excerpts we have quoted: it is clearly explained that Doras died because "the Father entered into me," says Jesus. Doras died because Jesus "delivered him to the God of Sinai"; these words make it impossible that Doras died of a heart attack caused by excessive anger. Jesus did not say that Doras killed himself through his

own wickedness, because of his anger.
Next error: it is not appropriate to say that God waits for the wicked on the other side to strike them down. To express it this way is disrespectful when speaking of God's justice. God being perfect, He must punish evil and reward good. But the damnation of the wicked does not respond to a passionate impulse in Him.

Theological Error No. 126: At the particular judgment, the future damned see God and Paradise for an "atomic minute."

This idea is a doctrinal error because there is no vision of God or Paradise during the particular judgment, not even for a fraction of a second. For the purposes of the Parable, Jesus said: "(23)In Hades, he looked up and, while he was in torment, he saw Abraham and Lazarus in his bosom from afar," but Valtorta transforms this into a beatific vision lasting a microsecond for all the dying during the particular judgment. This is where the error lies. Neither Jesus nor the Church teaches that the damned can lift up their eyes and see the saved, the elect in Heaven, nor that they could catch a glimpse of God for a microsecond. Such a vision would be enough to make them eternally happy, for God is infinite and sublime.

Theological Error No. 127: The will of the damned would change and become good after their particular judgment

since the rich man said, "I do not want my brothers to suffer the same punishment as me." Therefore, he would be motivated by an altruistic and benevolent intention toward his brothers.

On the contrary, death fixes the evil will of the damned at the

the moment when free will is taken away by the cessation of the physiological, bodily life of the body, as St. Thomas Aquinas teaches in the *Supplement to the Summa Theologica*, question 98, article 1: "Although the damned desire certain good by their natural will, which they retain, nevertheless, by the very fact that they are absolutely turned away from the ultimate end of right reason (from which the goodness of the will must proceed), it must be said that there is no good will in them." Their aversion to God and their attachment to sin are irreversible. We choose our eternity with our body and soul, not with our soul when the body has ceased to have a beating heart and a brain with electrical activity. One of the signs of physical death is a flat electroencephalogram for a certain number of minutes. There is no choice after definitive cardiac arrest. The rich man asks that his brothers be warned solely out of selfishness, because he knows that his punishment will be greater due to the bad example he has set for his brothers; he knows that he will be partly responsible for their damnation. Valtorta invents an altruistic motive, whereas the motive of the rich man is purely selfish.

Theological Error No. 128: "This parable has such a clear meaning that it does not need to be explained."

The fact that Valtorta's false Jesus says, "This parable has such a clear meaning that it does not need to be explained," proves that he is not Jesus, since as God, Jesus knows very well how this parable is interpreted by many in an erroneous and even heretical sense. It is therefore false to say that this parable does not need to be explained.

To help our beloved brothers and sisters who are currently being deceived by Maria Valtorta and to prove how stupid and false it is to say that "This parable has

such a clear meaning that it does not need to be explained," we are publishing the comments of the Fathers of the Church. Let us hope that the contrast between Valtorta's doctrinal errors, her idle additions, and the richness of the saints' explanations will help them understand how much *the Gospel as it was revealed to me* causes them harm by distancing them from the true light given by God through the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.

Theological Error No. 129: The lie of the unredacted notebooks.

Perhaps realizing the doctrinal error of writing "that atom of time in which my soul saw God," Maria Valtorta made two corrections in the typed version. These two corrections, which amount to crossing out the handwritten notebook since the meaning of what is written is changed, are known to us from notes 5 and 6 on the website maria-valtorta.org: "[5] 'He turned his eyes toward Heaven, which he had glimpsed. This should be understood as Maria Valtorta commented on a typed copy: "He turned his eyes toward the limbo of the saints whom he had glimpsed... and whose peaceful beauty was already indescribable..." " [6] 'During that second when my soul caught a glimpse of God' must be understood in the sense of 'at the moment of the particular judgment,' as Maria Valtorta notes on a typewritten copy. So note 5 suggests that it is a question of seeing limbo, and note 6 suggests that it is a question of seeing only what happens at the particular judgment. Whereas the manuscript notebook says "that atom of time that my soul saw God." So when Valtorta writes "my soul saw God," it should be understood as "my soul saw limbo" or "my soul saw the particular judgment." The three propositions are irreconcilable because seeing God is neither seeing limbo nor seeing the particular judgment; in fact, there is no micro-vision

of God during the particular judgment.

The Rich Man and Lazarus according to Valtorta:

191.5 *(...) the sight of Lazarus' misery and kindness was a constant reproach to him (...) his dogs (...) came and brought him the scraps from the rich men's tables. Thus, thanks to these animals, Lazarus survived (...) 191.6 - One day Lazarus died (...) the rich man died (...) the wicked rich man had his spirit buried in hell (...) in that horrible prison, drinking and eating fire and darkness, finding hatred and torture on all sides (...) he raised his eyes to Heaven. Towards Heaven, which he had seen in a flash of light, for a fraction of a second, and whose indescribable beauty remained with him and was a torment among the most atrocious torments. And he saw Abraham up there (...) blessed... and (...) poor Lazarus, formerly despised, rejected, miserable, and now (...) beautiful in the light of God and his holiness, rich in the love of God (...) 191.7 (...) I have five brothers. I never understood love (...) but now I understand what a terrible thing it is not to be loved. And since here, where I am, there is hatred, now I have understood, during this atom of time that my soul has seen God, what Love is. I don't want my brothers to suffer the same pains as me (...) send Lazarus (...) to tell them that hell exists and that it is something atrocious and that those who do not love God and their neighbor go to hell. (...) This parable has such a clear meaning that it does not need to be explained. Saturday, June 16, 1945. T3ch52. T3ch191.*

Commentary by the Church Fathers on the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus

(Luke 16:19-31) in the Golden Chain of St. Thomas Aquinas:

Luke 16 [19] There was a rich man who was clothed in purple and fine linen and who feasted sumptuously every day. [20] A poor man named Lazarus was lying at his gate, covered

of ulcers, [21] and wishing to fill himself with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, but even the dogs came and licked his ulcers. [22] Now it came to pass that the poor man died and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and was buried. ([23]) In Hades, he looked up and saw Abraham far away with Lazarus in his bosom. ([24]) and he cried out, 'Abraham, our father, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am in agony in this flame. ([25]) Abraham replied, 'My son, remember that you received your good things during your lifetime, and likewise Lazarus received his evil things; now he is comforted here, and you are in agony.
[26] Moreover, between us and you there is a great chasm forever, so that those who would like to pass from here to you cannot do so, nor can anyone from there pass to us. ([27]) And the rich man said, 'Then I beg you, father, send Lazarus to my father's house, ([28]) for I have five brothers, so that he may warn them, lest they also come to this place of torment. ([29]) Abraham replied, 'They have Moses and the prophets; let them listen to them. ([30]) No, Abraham, our father, he replied, but if someone from the dead goes to them, they will repent. ([31]) But Abraham said to him, 'If they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, they will not believe even if someone rises from the dead.'"

Verses 19-21

Bede. The Savior had just exhorted his listeners to make friends with the riches of iniquity, and as the Pharisees mocked his teachings, he confirmed them with the following example: "There was a rich man," etc. — St. Chrys. (hom. on the rich.) "There was," and not "there is," for he passed like a fleeting shadow. — St. Ambr. Not all poverty has the privilege of holiness, just as not all wealth is necessarily criminal, but just as it is a soft and sensual life that dishonors

riches, it is holiness that makes poverty commendable.

"He was dressed in purple and fine linen." — Bede. Purple is the color of kings' clothing, obtained from sea shells by making an incision with iron. What the Vulgate translates as "byssus" is a type of very white and very soft linen. — St. Gregory (Homily 40 on the Gospels). If the search for fine and precious garments were not sinful, the Savior would not have described these various details with such care. Indeed, one desires luxury in clothing only for the sake of vain glory, to obtain greater consideration; for who would want to dress in sumptuous garments if no one were to see them? — St. Chrys. (as above) This man covered the ashes, dust, and earth with purple and silk, or rather, the ashes, dust, and earth wore purple and silk. His table matched his clothes. So it is with us: such is our table, such are our clothes: "And every day he gave a sumptuous feast."
— St. Gregory (Moral., 1, 5.) Let us note here with attention that it is almost impossible to hold frequent feasts without becoming guilty; for almost always voluptuousness is the inseparable companion of such feasts, when the body is softened by earthly pleasures, the heart abandons itself to unrestrained joy.

"There was also a beggar named Lazarus." — St. Ambrose. It seems that this is a story rather than a parable, since there is a precise designation of the name. — St. Chrys. (as above). In the parable, on the contrary, an example is given and the names are left unsaid. The word Lazarus means "he who is helped"; indeed, he was poor and had God as his support. — St. Cyr. Or again, this story of the rich man and Lazarus is presented in the form of a parable to teach those who possess great riches that they will incur severe condemnation if they refuse to

help the poor in their need. A Jewish tradition reports that there was then in Jerusalem a man named Lazarus, overwhelmed by both poverty and illness, and it is he whom Our Lord takes here as an example to give greater clarity to his divine teachings. — St. Gregory (Homily 40 on the Gospels). Note also that among the people, the names of the rich are much better known than those of the poor; yet Our Lord here tells us the name of the poor man and passes over the name of the rich man in silence, to teach us that God knows and loves the humble, while He does not know the proud. A new trial was added to his poverty; he was a victim of both poverty and suffering: "He was lying at his door, covered with sores."

St. Chrys. (as above) He lay at the door, so that the rich man could not say, "I did not see him; no one told me about him." So he saw him every time he went in and out. The Savior adds that this poor man was covered with sores to highlight the cruelty of the rich man. O most unhappy of men, you see your body in that of your fellow man, dying and lying at your door, and you have no pity for him! If you are insensitive to God's commandments, at least remember your own condition and fear that one day you may be reduced to this sad state. But even wealth offers little relief from illness when one possesses it; how great, then, is the misery of this poor man, who, covered with so many wounds, forgets his painful sufferings and remembers only the hunger he feels
: "He wanted to fill himself with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table" and seemed to say to him: Give me alms from what you throw away from your table, and make a profit from what you lose.

St. Ambrose. The insolence and pride of the rich are revealed here in unmistakable signs: "And no one gave him any."

The rich, in fact, are so forgetful of their condition that they imagine themselves to be of a superior nature, and find in the very misery of the poor a new stimulus for their pleasures. They mock the poor, insult the unfortunate, and go so far as to rob those whom they should have pitied. — St. Augustine (Sermon 25 on the Parables of the Lord). Indeed, the avarice of the rich is insatiable; it has no fear of God, no regard for men, it does not spare its father, it betrays the sacred rights of friendship, it oppresses the widow and seizes the property of the orphan.

St. Gregory (Hom. 40). Add to this that the poor man saw the rich man every day, surrounded by a large retinue of obsequious people, while he was completely abandoned in his infirmity and poverty, for clear proof that no one came to visit him was that dogs came peacefully to lick his sores: "And the dogs came," adds the Savior, "and licked his sores."
— St. Chrys. (as above). These compassionate animals came to lick the wounds that no man deigned to wash and dress.

St. Gregory (Hom. 40). In a single act, God exercises a double judgment. He allows poor Lazarus to lie at the door of the rich man, so that the unmerciful rich man may thus aggravate the severity of his condemnation, and also so that the poor man may increase his rights to reward, for the former saw every day the one whom he should have pitied, and the latter had constantly before his eyes the subject of his trial and his merit.

Verses 22-26.

St. Chrys. (homily on the rich man.) We have seen what the fate of each of them was on earth; let us now see what their fate is in hell. All that was temporal has passed away, and here they are facing eternity. Both

are dead, one is received by the angels, the other encounters only torment: "Now it came to pass that the beggar died, and he was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom," etc. Such great pains are suddenly changed into ineffable delights. He is carried because his sufferings had exhausted him, and to spare him the fatigue of walking; and he is carried by angels. One angel is not enough to carry this poor man; they come in great numbers, as if to form a choir of joy and gladness, each one happy to touch such a precious burden. They love to take on such burdens to lead men to heaven. Now, he was carried into Abraham's bosom to rest from his long sufferings. Abraham's bosom is paradise. The angels, who became his servants, carried this poor man and laid him in Abraham's bosom, because in the midst of the deep contempt he was subjected to on earth, he did not give in to despair or blasphemy, saying: "This rich man, though he is wicked, lives in joy and knows no suffering, while I cannot even get the food I need."

S. Aug. (from the original source, 4, 46.) If you believe that Abraham's bosom is something corporeal, I fear that you are not bringing to the discussion of such an important question all the gravity and seriousness that it demands. Indeed, will you delude yourselves to such an extent as to believe that the bosom of a single man (taken in the material sense) can contain such a large number of souls, and even more (according to your opinion), as many bodies as the angels carry there, such as that of Lazarus, unless you say that his soul is the only one that deserved to reach Abraham's bosom? If, therefore, you do not want to fall into a childish error, understand by Abraham's bosom a place far from this world, a quiet and mysterious abode where Abraham is found, and which bears his name, not because it is reserved for him alone, but because he is the father of a great number of nations, and God has proposed him as their model

as the greatest model of faith.

St. Gregory (Hom. 40). While these two hearts (that of the poor man and that of the rich man) were on earth, they had in heaven a single judge who prepared the poor man for glory through suffering and who supported the rich man by reserving him for punishment: "The rich man also died." — St. Chrys. (hom. 6 on the 2nd letter to the Cor.) He died the death of the body, for his soul had been dead for a long time; he no longer did any of the works to which it gives life; all the warmth communicated to him by love for his neighbor was completely extinguished, and that soul was more dead than the body. (II disc. on Lazarus.) We do not see that anyone came to perform the duties of burial for this evil rich man as they did for Lazarus. As long as he was happy amid the pleasures of the broad way, he had a large number of flattering sycophants, but as soon as he breathed his last, they all abandoned him, for the Savior simply tells us, "And he was buried in Hades." But even during his life, his soul was as if buried and crushed in his body as in a tomb. — St. Augustine (Quest. evang., 2, 38.) This burial in hell signifies that abyss of torment which devours the proud and those who have been without mercy after this life. — St. Basil (on Isaiah 5). Hell is an immense place located in the depths of the earth, covered on all sides by thick darkness, whose opening leads into a deep abyss, through which descend the souls condemned to eternal torment. — St. Chrys. (hom. 53 of the incomplete work) Just as the prisons of kings are outside the cities, so hell is placed outside the world, and that is why it is called "outer darkness." (Mt 8:22:25) — Theophyl. There are those who claim that hell is the passage from the visible to the invisible, and the complete deformation of the soul, for as long as the soul of the sinner is in its body, it is visible through its actions, but as soon as it leaves the body, it loses, so to speak, all its form.

St. Chrys. (2 discourses on Lazarus.) The poor man, during his lifetime, found a new increase of suffering in his unhappy condition, compared with the pleasures and happiness he witnessed; likewise, what added to the torments of the rich man after his death was being plunged into hell and witnessing the happiness of Lazarus, so that his punishment was intolerable to him, both by nature and by comparison with the glory of Lazarus: "Now lifting up his eyes, when he was in torment," etc. — St. Chrys. (hom. on the evil rich man.) He raises his eyes to see him above him and not below him; for Lazarus was indeed above him and he below. Lazarus had been carried away by the angels, and he was in the throes of infinite torments. Therefore, Our Lord does not say: When he was in torment, but "in torment," for he was entirely in torment, and only his eyes were free to see the joy of Lazarus. God allows him the use of his eyes to increase his suffering by making him witness to a happiness of which he is deprived, for the riches of others are true torments for the poor.

St. Gregory (Moral., IV, 27.) Now, if Abraham were not yet in these lower places, the wicked rich man would not have been able to see him from the midst of his torments; for those who had followed the ways of the heavenly homeland were, upon leaving this life, held in limbo, not to be punished as guilty, but to rest in that mysterious abode until the redemption of the Mediator came to open for them the entrance to the kingdom that had been closed since the fall of our first parents.

St. Chrys. (Hom. 4, on the Epistle to the Philippians.) There were undoubtedly many righteous people among the poor, but it was the one he saw lying at his door that came to his mind and increased his sadness: "And Lazarus in his bosom." — St. Chrys. (II Disc. on Lazarus.) Let us learn from this that those whom we have wronged will then present themselves before our eyes.

. Now, it is not in the bosom of another, but in the bosom of Abraham that the wicked rich man sees Lazarus, because Abraham was full of charity, and the wicked rich man is condemned for his cruelty. Abraham sat at his door and sought travelers to compel them to enter his house; the wicked rich man drove away even those who stood at his door.

— St. Gregory (hom. 40). Here is this rich man who, in the midst of his torments, implores the protection of the one whom he did not deign to take pity on during his lifetime. — Theophyl. However, it is not to Lazarus but to Abraham that he addresses his words, perhaps out of a sense of shame, and thinking that Lazarus, whom he judged by himself, remembered what he had suffered: "And he cried out to him." — St. Chrys. (hom. on the rich man.) The greatness of his sufferings wrung this great cry from him: "Father Abraham," as if he were saying to him: I call you my father according to nature, like the prodigal son who lost all his possessions; although through my own fault I have lost the right to call you my father: "Have mercy on me." It is useless to express this repentance in a place where penance is no longer possible; it is suffering that wrings this act of repentance from you, not the feelings of your heart. Moreover, I do not know if anyone in the kingdom of heaven can have mercy on someone in hell.

The Creator has compassion for his creatures. He is the only physician who can effectively cure their illnesses; no one else can deliver them. "Send Lazarus." Unfortunate one, you are mistaken; Abraham cannot send anyone; he can only receive. "So that he may dip the tip of his finger in water," In the past, you did not even deign to look at Lazarus, and now you ask for help from his finger; you should at least have done for him while he was alive what you are now asking of him; you desire a drop of water, you who once looked with disgust upon the most delicate dishes

delicate dishes with disgust.

See the judgment that the sinner's conscience brings against him; he dares not ask Lazarus to dip his whole finger. Here, then, is the rich man reduced to begging for help from the poor man who once suffered from hunger; the roles are reversed, and everyone can now see who was the real rich man and who was the real poor man. In the theaters, when evening comes and the actors withdraw and leave their costumes, those who were seen on stage as generals and magistrates show themselves to all as they are in all their misery. So it is when death comes and the spectacle of life ends, all the masks of poverty and wealth fall away, and it is exclusively by their works that we judge who are the truly rich, who are the truly poor, and who are worthy of glory or shame.

— St. Gregory (hom. 40.) That rich man who refused to give this poor man covered with sores even the crumbs from his table, now thrown into hell, is reduced to begging for the slightest help; he begs for a drop of water, he who refused the crumbs that fell from his table.

St. Basil (Greek Fathers) This rich man receives the just punishment he deserves, the fire and torment of hell, a parched tongue; groans replace the harmonious sounds of the lyre; a burning thirst replaces the most delicious drinks; thick darkness replaces brilliant and licentious spectacles; the worm that never sleeps replaces the assiduous attentions of flatterers: "Refresh my tongue, for I suffer cruelly in this flame." — St. Chrys. (hom. 2, on the Epistle to the Philippians) If he suffers such cruel torments, it is not because he was rich, but because he was without mercy. — St. Gregory (hom. 40.) Let us learn from this what punishment is reserved for those who take the property of others, since this rich man is condemned to the fires of hell for not having

give of his own possessions. — St. Ambrose. He suffers even more because it is a torment for a sensual man to be deprived of the pleasures of life; the water he asks for is the relief of every soul overwhelmed by pain.

St. Gregory (hom. 40.) Why, in the midst of his torments, does he ask for a drop of water to refresh his tongue? Because his tongue, by just punishment, suffered more cruelly to atone for the excesses of speech he had committed in the midst of his feasts; for it is indeed at feasts that intemperance of the tongue is most frequent. — St. Chrys. (hom. on evil riches.) How many proud words had that tongue also uttered! It is therefore just that punishment should fall on sin; and that the tongue that has been so guilty should also be punished more severely. — St. Augustine (Questiones evangelicae, 2, 38.) Or again, his request for a drop of water to refresh his tongue, when he was entirely surrounded by flames, is the fulfillment of what is written: "Death and life are in the power of the tongue" (Proverbs 18) and again: "You must confess with your mouth to be saved" (Romans 10), which his pride prevented him from doing. The tip of the finger signifies the smallest of the works of mercy inspired by the Holy Spirit.

St. Augustine (On the Nails of the Soul, IV, 16). You say that all the members of the soul are described here, because it is said that the rich man lifted up his eyes; these eyes represent the head.
; the tongue, the mouth, and the finger, the whole hand. But how is it that these names of members applied to God do not lead you to conclude that he has a body, whereas you draw this conclusion for the soul? Is it because they must be taken literally when referring to creatures, and figuratively and metaphorically when referring to the Creator? Thus you give us bodily wings because the creature, that is, man, and not the Creator, says through the mouth of the Psalmist: "If I

take my flight (my wings) at dawn." (Ps 138.) Now, if from these words, "To refresh my tongue," you conclude that the soul of the rich wicked man had a bodily tongue in hell, then our tongue must also have bodily hands in this life, since it is written, "Death and life are in the hands of the tongue." (Prov. 18.)

St. Gregory of Nyssa (Discourse 5, on the Beatitudes). Just as the most perfect mirrors faithfully represent the forms of faces as they appear before them, joyful if they are joyful, sad if they are sad, so the just judgment of God is the faithful reproduction of the dispositions of our soul; the rich man had no compassion on the poor man lying at his door, and in turn finds no compassion when he is in such need of mercy: "And Abraham said to him, 'My son.'" — St. Chrys. (Disc. 2 and 3, on Lazarus, and hom. on the rich man.) See the goodness of the patriarch, he calls him his son out of a feeling of tenderness and gentleness; but nevertheless he grants no help to the one who has made himself unworthy of it. "Remember," he says to him, that is, remember the past, do not forget that you swam in delights and received goods during your life, that is, what you considered to be true goods; it is impossible for you to reign here after having reigned on earth; riches cannot be real both on earth and in hell: "Just as Lazarus received evil." It is not that Lazarus regarded them as evils; Abraham is speaking here according to the ideas of the rich man, who regarded poverty, hunger, and the sufferings of illness as extreme evils. Therefore, when the violence of illness overwhelms us, let the thought of Lazarus make us bear the evils of this life with joy.

St. Augustine (Quest. Evang., 2, 38.) Abraham therefore gives this answer to the wicked rich man because he has placed all his affections in the enjoyments of the earth and has not loved

other life than the one in which he displayed all the pomp of his pride. He adds that Lazarus received evil, that is, he understood that the fragility of the things of this life, the labors, the pains, the sufferings were the punishment of sin, because we all die in Adam, who became subject to death through his disobedience. — St. Chrys. (Disc. 3, on Lazarus.) He also says to the rich man: "You received your good things in this life," as something that was due to you. That is to say: If you did any good that was worthy of reward, you received in this world all that was due to you, feasts, riches, the joy that accompanies a life that is always happy, and great prosperity. If, on the contrary, Lazarus committed any fault, he made amends for it through poverty, hunger, and the excesses of misery under which he groaned. Both of you arrived here naked and stripped, one of his sins, and that is why he receives consolation as his share, the other of justice, and that is why you suffer a punishment that can never be softened: "Now he is comforted; and you suffer." — St. Gregory. (hom. 40.) If, therefore, you remember having done some good, and that good was followed by happiness and prosperity, fear that this happiness may be the reward for the good you have done; just as when you see the poor fall into some faults, think that the crucible of poverty is sufficient to purify those whom this slight remnant of corruption might have defiled. — St. Chrys. (Disc. 3, on Lazarus.) You will say to me: Is there no one who can be happy and peaceful in this life and in the next? No, it is difficult and almost impossible, for if poverty does not overwhelm us, ambition torments us; if illness does not tear us apart, anger inflames us; if we are not beset by temptations, we are prey to evil thoughts. Now, it is no small task to curb anger, stifle criminal desires, calm the violent movements of vain glory, repress pomp and pride, and lead a penitent and mortified life. This

, however, an indispensable condition for salvation.

St. Gregory (as above). Or one may still reply that the wicked receive good things in this life because they place all their joy in this passing happiness; just as the righteous may have some good things in common, but without receiving them as a reward, for since they aspire to better things, that is, to eternal goods, they do not consider the goods they may receive here to be true goods.

St. Chrys. (Disc. 4, on Lazarus.) After God's grace, it is on our own efforts that we must base our hope of salvation, without counting on our parents, our relatives, or our friends, for even a brother cannot redeem his brother (Psalm 48:8). That is why Abraham adds: "Moreover, between us and you there is a great chasm fixed forever." — Theophyl. This great chasm signifies the immense distance that separates the righteous from sinners; their affections on earth were very different, and so are their dwellings after this life. — St. Chrys. (hom. on the evil rich.) He says that a great chasm has been established, because it cannot be destroyed, agitated, or shaken.

St. Ambrose. A great chasm therefore exists between the rich and the poor, because after death the merits of each are immutable: "So that those who would wish to pass from here to you, or from there to here, cannot do so." — St. Chrys. (hom. on the wicked rich man) He seems to be saying: We can see you, but we cannot pass where you are: we see the danger we have avoided, and you see the happiness you have lost; our joy is an added torment to you, just as your torments add to our joy.

— St. Gregory (hom. 40.) Just as the reprobate desire to pass over to the side of the elect and leave the place of their sufferings, so the righteous feel an inner desire to go to those who are prey to these unspeakable torments and to deliver them. But the souls of the righteous, although the goodness of their nature makes them susceptible to this feeling of compassion, are closely united to the justice of their author and dominated by such a sense of righteousness and equity that they feel no mercy for the reprobate. Thus, neither can the wicked enter the abode of the good, being held back by the chains of eternal damnation, nor can the righteous pass over to the side of the reprobate, because, being raised to the height of the justice of God's judgments, they cannot feel any compassion for them.

— Theophyl. From these words we can draw one of the strongest arguments against the followers of Origen, who claim that the torments of hell will come to an end, and that a time will come when sinners will be reunited with the righteous and with God.

— St. Augustine (Questiones Evangeliques, 2, 38). The immutability of divine judgment proves beyond doubt that the righteous, even if they wanted to, cannot perform any act of mercy toward sinners, and God warns them thereby to be useful during this life to all those who may benefit from their good offices, lest even after being received into heaven, they be powerless to help those they love; for these words: "That they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles," do not apply to the proud or to souls without mercy, but to those who have made friends with works of charity; and if the righteous receive them into the eternal tabernacles, it is not by their own power and as if they were rewarding them of themselves, but by the permission of God.

Verses 27-31.

St. Gregory (Homily 40 on the Gospels) When the rich man, tormented in the midst of the flames, lost all hope for himself, his thoughts turned to his loved ones whom he had left on earth: "And he said, 'I beg you, father Abraham, send Lazarus to my father's house.'" — St. Augustine (Questiones evangelicae). He asks for Lazarus to be sent because he understands that he is unworthy to bear witness to the truth, and since he has been unable to obtain the slightest relief from his sufferings, he hopes even less to leave hell to go and make the truth known.

St. Gregory (Hom. 40). The torment of the damned sometimes inspires them with a sterile charity, and causes them to be moved by a special love for their parents, who, in their affection for their sins, did not love themselves. This is what makes him say: "For I have five brothers, so that he might attest that they too might not come to this place of torment."

St. Ambrose. This wicked rich man is too late in beginning to instruct others, when there is no more time to learn or to teach. — St. Gregory (hom. 40). Let us note here the additional suffering of this rich man, whom the flames torment so cruelly. God leaves him with knowledge and memory for his torment. He recognizes Lazarus, whom he did not deign to look at during his lifetime, and remembers his brothers whom he left on earth, for to add to the pains suffered by sinners, God allows them to see the glory of those whom they despised and to suffer the punishment of those whom they loved with a fruitless friendship. When the rich man asks that Lazarus be sent to him, Abraham replies, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them listen to them."

St. Chrys. (Discourse 4 on Lazarus.) That is to say, your solicitude.

for the salvation of your brothers is no greater than that of God, who created them and gave them teachers to instruct them and encourage them to do good. Moses and the prophets are the writings of Moses and the prophetic oracles. — St. Ambrose. Words by which God shows with the utmost clarity that the Old Testament is the firm foundation of our faith, thus repressing the unbelief of the Jews and rejecting all the perverse interpretations of heretics.

St. Gregory (Hom. 40). But this wicked rich man, who throughout his life had despised the word of God, believed that his parents would do no more: "And he said, 'No, father Abraham, but if someone from the dead goes to them, they will repent.'" — St. Chrys. (as above). Since he had nothing but contempt for the Scriptures and regarded them as fables, he judged his brothers according to his own feelings. — St. Gregory of Nyssa. (Book on the Soul and Resurrection) These words contain yet another lesson, which is that Lazarus' soul is free from all concern for present things and has no regard for what it has left behind. The rich man, on the contrary, even after death, is still attached to the fleshly life as if with glue, for he whose soul is immersed in the affections of the flesh remains a slave to his passions, even when his soul is separated from his body. — St. Gregory (hom. 40.) Abraham gives the wicked rich man this truthful reply: "If they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, someone would rise from the dead, they would not believe," because those who despise the words of the law will find it all the more difficult to practice the precepts of the Redeemer, who rose from the dead, since they are much more sublime.

St. Chrys. (Discourse 4 on Lazarus.) The Jews are proof that those who are not docile to the teachings of Scripture would not listen any more to a dead man raised to life, since they wanted to kill Lazarus after his resurrection and persecute

the Apostles, even though they saw several dead people raised to life at the time of the crucifixion (cf. Mt 27:52). But to convince you even more that the authority of the Scriptures and the prophets carries greater weight than the testimony of a dead man raised to life, note that any dead man is a servant, whereas everything the Scriptures teach is taught by God himself. So even if a dead man rises, or an angel descends from heaven, the Scriptures are much more worthy of belief, for it is the Lord of angels, the master of the living and the dead, who is their author. Moreover, if God had judged that the resurrection of the dead could be useful to the living, he would not have omitted this means of salvation, he who offers himself in all things for our benefit. But suppose that frequent resurrections of the dead took place, we would soon cease to pay attention to them; the devil would use this means to introduce perverse doctrines by seeking to imitate this miracle through his minions. He could not, of course, truly raise the dead, but he would deceive the eyes of spectators by certain tricks, or incite some to feign a real death.

St. Augustine (On the Duty of Caring for the Dead, chap. XIV.) One will say to me: If the dead have no concern for the living, how could the rich man have asked Abraham to send Lazarus to his five brothers? But does this request necessarily imply that he knew what his brothers were doing or what they were suffering? He therefore cared for the living, but without knowing anything about what they were doing, just as our concern extends to the dead, even though we are completely ignorant of their present state. It is also asked: How did Abraham know Moses and the prophets, that is, their books? How could he have known that the rich man had lived in luxury and Lazarus in suffering? We answer that he could know this, not during their lifetime, but after their death, when Lazarus told him, an explanation which does not destroy the truth of these words of the prophet: " Abraham d i d not know us."

(Isaiah 63.) The souls of the dead can still know something through the angels who preside over things here below. Finally, the spirit of God can reveal to them, either in the past or in the future, what they need to know.

St. Augustine (Quest. evang., 2, 38.) In an allegorical sense, we can see in this rich man the figure of the proud Jews, "who did not know the righteousness of God, and sought to establish their own righteousness" (Rom 10). The purple and linen are symbols of the kingdom: "The kingdom of God will be taken away from you" (Matt 21). These splendid feasts are the ostentation of the law in which they glorified themselves out of pride and to show themselves off rather than to use it for their salvation. This beggar, named Lazarus, which means "the one who is assisted," represents the poverty of the pagans or publicans, who obtain help all the more easily because they presume less on their own resources.
— St. Gregory (hom. 40.) Lazarus, covered with sores, is the figure of the pagan people, who convert to God and are not ashamed to confess their sins; his skin is covered with wounds, for what is the confession of sins but a breaking open of our inner wounds? Lazarus, covered with sores, "desired to be filled with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, and no one gave him any," because this proud people did not deign to admit any pagan to the knowledge of the law, and they let the words of this knowledge fall like crumbs from their table. — St. Augustine (quest. évang.) The dogs that came to lick the ulcers of the poor represent those deeply corrupt men, devoted to evil, who never cease to praise with open mouths the works of iniquity that are the object of public lamentation and regret by those who have committed them. — St. Gregory (hom. 40.) Sometimes in the Holy Scriptures, dogs represent preachers, according to these words of the Psalmist: "The tongue of your dogs shall drink the blood of your enemies." (Ps 67; cf. Isaiah 56:10.)

Indeed, the tongue of dogs heals the wounds it licks, and so the holy doctors, through the instructions that follow the confession of our sins, touch, as it were, with their tongues the wounds of our souls. The rich man was buried in hell, but Lazarus was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom, that is, into that mysterious place of rest, of which the truth says: "Many will come from the east and the west and will take their places with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the children of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness." It is from afar that the rich man raises his eyes to see Lazarus, because it is from the depths of the abyss where they suffer the pains due to their sins that the unfaithful see above them, enjoying an ineffable rest, the faithful whom, after the Last Judgment, they will no longer be able to contemplate in happiness. They see them from afar because they cannot reach them by their merits. It is especially in his tongue that the rich man endures the most intense suffering, because this unfaithful people always had on their lips the words of the law that they disdained to put into practice. He will therefore be more cruelly tormented in his tongue, which showed everyone that he knew perfectly well what he refused to practice. Abraham calls him his son, although he does not deliver him from his torments, because the ancestors of this unfaithful people have no compassion for rescuing from torment those whom they recognize as their children, but who have so numerous are those who have abandoned the examples of their faith.

St. Augustine (Quest. evang., 2, 39.) The five brothers whom the rich man said he had in his father's house represent the Jews, who are five in number because they were subject to the law given by Moses (cf. John 1:17; 7:19) and contained in the five books he wrote. — St. Chrys. (hom. on the rich man.) Or else this rich man had five brothers, that is, the five senses to which he was a slave; therefore he could not love

Lazarus, because his brothers do not love poverty. It is these brothers who have plunged you into these torments; they cannot be saved unless they die, otherwise it is necessary that the brothers dwell with their brother. But why do you ask me to send Lazarus? They have Moses and the prophets. Moses himself was poor like Lazarus, he who considered the poverty of Jesus Christ to be a greater treasure than all the riches of Egypt (Heb. 12), Jeremiah, thrown into a lake, was fed there with the bread of affliction. (Jer. 38.)

All these prophets are there to teach your brothers, but they cannot be saved unless someone rises from the dead, for these brothers, before the resurrection of Jesus Christ, led me to death; he is dead, but these brothers are risen, and now my eyes see Jesus Christ, my ears hear him, my hands can touch him. What we have just said is the condemnation of the Marcionites and Manicheans, who do not want to accept the Old Testament. See what Abraham says: "If they do not listen to Moses and the prophets," etc., words which mean: You do well to wait for him who is to rise from the dead, but it is Jesus Christ himself who speaks to you through the mouth of the prophets, and if you listen to them, it is him whom you listen to. — St. Gregory (hom. 40.) But since the Jewish people refused to hear the words of Moses in a spiritual sense, they could not attain the one whom Moses had foretold and announced.

St. Ambrose. We can also give this story another meaning: Lazarus is poor in this world, but he is rich in the eyes of God. For not all poverty is holy, just as not all possession of riches is necessarily criminal; it is the soft and sensual life that dishonors riches, just as it is holiness that makes poverty honorable. Or again, Lazarus is every apostolic man who is poor in words and rich in

faith, which clings to the true faith and does not seek vain adornments of speech. I will compare this man to one who, often beaten with rods by the Jews, offered, as it were, the sores of his body for the dogs to lick (2 Corinthians 11:24; cf. Deuteronomy 25:2-3). Blessed are those dogs who licked the drops of blood that flowed from these wounds and thus filled the mouths and hearts of those who must guard the house, watch over the flock, and defend it against wolves. And since bread is the figure of the word, and faith comes from the word, the crumbs of bread represent certain truths of the faith, that is, the mysteries of Scripture. Do not the Arians, who so eagerly seek the support of royal power to attack the truth of the Church, appear to you as clothed in purple and fine linen? As they preach error and lies in place of the truth, they multiply their pompous speeches. Thus the rich heresy has composed I know not how many gospels, while the poor faith has held fast to the one Gospel it received from God. Rich philosophy has made itself many gods, and the poor Church has recognized and worshiped only one God. Do not these riches seem to you to be true poverty, and this poverty true riches?

St. Augustine (Quest. evang.) This story can be interpreted in another way. Lazarus would be the figure of the Lord, lying at the door of the rich man, because the humiliations of his incarnation lowered him to the proud ears of the Jews. He desired to be satisfied with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, that is, he asked the Jews for the smallest works of justice that were not taken away by their pride from his table, that is, from his power, and that they might at least practice them, if not under the influence of a constantly virtuous life, at least from time to time and by chance, like the crumbs that fall from the table. The ulcers are the wounds of the Lord, and the dogs that came to lick them are the pagans, whom the Jews

considered unclean, and who, throughout the universe, taste with pious sweetness the wounds of the Lord in the sacrament of his body and blood. Abraham's bosom is the secret of the Father, where Jesus Christ ascended after his resurrection; he was carried there by the angels, because it was the angels who announced to his disciples (Matthew 28:7; Mark 16:7; Luke 24:9) that he had ascended into the bosom of the Father. The interpretation we have given above can be applied to the rest of the account, for the bosom of God can very well be understood as the place where (even before the resurrection) the souls of the righteous live in the company of God.

The Rich Man is in Hell, According to Pope Benedict XVI

Another example of why it was useful to comment on this parable is the mistake made by Pope Benedict XVI in his encyclical *Spe Salvi* (published in 2007). He expressed the idea that the rich man was not in hell. Then, during two *Angelus addresses* at Castel Gandolfo, he returned to the unanimous interpretation of the Church Fathers in their interpretation of this verse, namely that the rich man is condemned to eternal damnation in hell. *Benedict XVI, Angelus, Castel Gandolfo, Sunday, September 30, 2007: Dear brothers and sisters,* Today, the Gospel of Luke presents the parable of the rich man and poor Lazarus (*Lk* 16:19-31) (...) After death, Lazarus is welcomed "into Abraham's bosom," that is, into eternal bliss, while the rich man ends up in hell, "in torment." This is a new state of affairs that is final and irrevocable. It is therefore during one's lifetime that one must repent. Doing so afterwards is useless.

Benedict XVI, Angelus*, Castel Gandolfo, Sunday, September 26, 2010: Dear brothers and sisters,* In this Sunday's Gospel (*Lk* 16:19-31), Jesus tells the parable of the rich man and poor Lazarus. The former lives in

luxury and selfishness, and when he dies, he ends up in hell (...) But the message of the parable goes further: (...) we must listen to the Lord (...) otherwise, after death, it will be too late to change our minds. So this parable tells us (...) that our eternal destiny is conditioned by our attitude (...)

Theological Error No. 130 and Indecency No. 136: Mary feels in her mind the caresses that people give to Jesus

Mary says: *20.8 (...) I felt in my mind the pain of the whips and thorns, the torture of the nails and the cross. But I also feel all the caresses given to my Jesus. They are like kisses given to me (...)*. Vision March 28, 1944. T1ch31. T1ch20.
This kind of sensual stigmatization never existed; it ridicules and demeans the Virgin Mary. It is wrong to write that the Virgin Mary felt the caresses that were given to her son. This error ties in with the more general problem of caresses in Maria Valtorta's writings and the sensual image she gives of the Virgin Mary, to the point that when she is prevented from kissing her son, her lips tremble (cf. The Wedding at Cana, Valtorta version).

Theological Error No. 131: Jesus does not know the future and corrects himself after the fact.

Theological Error No. 132: Jesus says that the doctors will judge *the Gospel as I have revealed it to be* "unacceptable and useless."

312.14 – Jesus says: "In order to give readers an indication, I had indicated the place of John's imprisonment by the names now in use. Objections were raised. Now I specify: 'Bithynia and Mysia' for those who

want the old names. But this Gospel is for the simple and the little ones, not for the doctors, for whom, in their majority, it is unacceptable and useless. The simple and the little ones will understand "Anatolia" better than "Bithynia or Mysia" (...) Wednesday, October 24, 1945. T4ch178. T5ch312.

-If it was Jesus speaking to Maria Valtorta, he would have known in advance that he would be criticized for using names that were in use in 1945, so he would have used the ancient names from the outset. Or better still, to avoid any criticism, he could have simply quoted the ancient names while giving the current ones. This way of doing things, where Jesus complains but agrees to correct his copy, betrays its human mediumistic origin. If it was God speaking to Maria Valtorta, God being perfect, he would either stick to his first version or prevent any criticism by giving both the old names and the current names, and everyone would be happy. A God who corrects himself in response to human criticism indicates that he is not God but fragile like a human being.

"The Gospel as it was revealed to me" is "for the simple and the little ones," and doctors will judge it "unacceptable and useless." Several of the deeds and actions attributed to Jesus and Mary on Good Friday are indeed unacceptable. The Mother of Jesus did not insult or curse anyone, she did not rebel against God, she did not ask for mortuary customs to be violated (cf. she asks to be locked in the tomb for three days and initially refuses the funeral rites for her son). Valtorta also writes that Mary kissed Jesus on the mouth after his resurrection (cf. 618.2, Vision of February 21, 1944). Jesus' kisses on the mouth of children can be considered sexual assault on minors under the age of 15, punishable by seven years in prison and a fine of €150,000 (Article 222-29 of the French Penal Code).

It is difficult to understand why bishops allow the sale of writings that propose kissing babies or boys under the age of fifteen on the mouth as a model. How many pedophile priests will be able to tell their victims that it is acceptable to let them kiss them on the mouth because Jesus did so several times according to a mystic whose writings are encouraged and approved by Francis, Pius XII, Saint Padre Pio, Saint Mother Teresa, Saint Paul VI, Saint John Paul II, Pope Benedict XVI, and the Italian bishop where Maria Valtorta lived, etc.? False approvals are continually invented by Valtortists despite repeated condemnations by the Catholic Church. Maria Valtorta's error lies in the fact that the criticisms levelled at "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" are more serious than mere unacceptability or uselessness. Jesus did not warn Maria Valtorta in advance of the doctrinal errors that would be found in "The Gospel as Revealed to Me."

Indecency No. 137: Jesus' lack of tact in revealing the secrets of the Annunciation without warning his mother that he was going to do so, leaving her with a fait accompli.

Indecency No. 138: Mary corrects Jesus in public.

(Yet according to Valtorta, the Virgin Mary knew before Jesus' resurrection that he was God; since when does a creature call God to account? "Why, Son, have you done this to me? The secrets of the King are sacred..."

348.12 – Jesus gently leans toward Mary (...) "What was your answer, O most pure Virgin (...) And Mary, as if in a dream, slowly, smiling, her eyes wide with tears of joy: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord! Let it be done to me

according to his Word." (...) Mary lifts her tear-stained face and murmurs: "Why, Son, have you done this to me? The secrets of the King are sacred..." "But the King can reveal them when He wants, Mother. Dec. 2, 1945. T5ch36 T5ch348.

Theological Error No. 133: God forgave original sin by looking at Mary.

God did not forgive original sin by looking at Mary, but because of the merits of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, true God and true man, who died on the cross for the redemption of our sins: Romans, 5 ([18]) *Therefore, just as through one man's offense all men were condemned, so through one man's righteous act all men are justified. ([19]) For just as through the disobedience of one man the many were made sinners, so through the obedience of one the many will be made righteous.*

Vulgarity No. 2: God (...) was heavy with you and carried you as his sweet burden.

Oddity No. 1: God rejoicing at feeling Mary moving within him.

Oddity No. 2: God painfully gave birth to Mary to give her to the world.

Theological Error No. 134: Jesus calls Mary "Council of God," even though no creature is the council of God.

Yes, O Mother, God, the Immense, the Sublime, the Virgin, the Uncreated, was heavy with you and carried you as his sweetest burden, rejoicing to feel you stirring within him, within him

giving the smiles with which He made Creation! You whom He painfully gave birth to in order to give you to the world, (...) Counsel of God, so that by looking at you He could forgive the Fall, for you alone and through you alone know how to love as all of humanity gathered together does not know how to love. (...).
December 2, 1945. T5ch36. T5ch348.

Elevating Mary to a quasi-divine status and suggesting that she advises God is a disrespectful theological error that violates Church doctrine and the proper veneration of Mary. The term "counsel of God" suggests a wisdom that could rival that of God, to guide or influence the divine will. God is omniscient; no one advises him: "Who has directed the Spirit of the Lord, or who has been his counselor? With whom did he consult, to be instructed, to be taught the way of justice, to be taught wisdom and shown the path of understanding? Isaiah 40:13-14. Under the pretext of magnifying Mary, Valtorta launches a full-scale attack on the just veneration due to her. This theological nonsense distances the reader from the true Catholic teachings.

Theological Error No. 135: The Virgin faints at the Annunciation.

348.11 (...) It was here that the Mystery came to pass... And a modest woman, the most modest of all women, she who did not even know the instinctive urges of the flesh, fainted before the Angel of the Lord, because even an angel disturbs the humility and modesty of the Virgin, and she did not calm down until she heard him speak, and she believed, and she spoke the words by which "their" love became Flesh and would conquer Death, and there is no water that can extinguish it nor any perversion that can overwhelm it..."
December 2, 1945. T5ch36. T5ch348.

Hysterical Gospel. Maria Valtorta projects her own psychological fragility onto the Mother of Jesus. Mary felt human emotions such as fear, sadness, and joy more fully than we do, but without allowing them to dominate her, take control of her, or cloud her judgment or freedom. God did not rush, traumatize, or terrify the Virgin Mary at the Annunciation. To invent such a dramatization is to mock her and disrespect her.

Theological Error No. 136: The Virgin Mary publicly thanked God for "granting her to attain perfect love, as perfect as a creature can possess."

No saint boasts of his perfection or holiness, for this is contrary to humility.

Theological Error No. 137: One must attain fusionary love in order to "always do God's will with good will."

Holiness consists in the heroism of the virtues and not in an illusory "fusion," which would rather lead one to believe that true holiness is unattainable until this "fusion" has been achieved. Saint Thérèse of the Child Jesus showed how it was possible to live a life of great holiness in everyday life. That is why Pope Pius XII called her "the greatest saint of the 20th century."

454.3 (...) [Mary:] *There is one thing above all for which I thank the Most High: for having granted me to attain perfect love, as perfect as a creature can possess it (...) What love is mine? What love must one have?*

What does it take to be able to say these words? Love of union with God, total union, total abandonment, being lost in Him, being nothing more than a part of Him, just as your hand is a part of you and does what your head commands. That is my love, and the love we must have in order to always do God's Will willingly." (...)
Wednesday, July 3, 1946. T6ch146. T7ch454.

Here we find another case of false praise of the Virgin Mary, where under the guise of veneration, she is disrespected by exaggeration because her relationship with God, with others, and with herself is profoundly distorted. Praise, when it is not in accordance with the truth, becomes mockery, a subtle profanation. While the Virgin Mary is the servant of the Lord (Luke 1:38) and her humility is one of the keys to her mystery, Valtorta describes her as boastful. Pathological Marian piety leads to betraying Christ. To say exaggerated things about Mary is tantamount to blasphemy.

Theological Error No. 138: Mary "second in the ecclesiastical hierarchy."

Seconda a Pietro come gerarchia ecclesiastica = second after Peter in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The translation
"coming after Peter in the ecclesiastical hierarchy" does not remove the serious doctrinal error because in Catholic theology, the lay faithful, like the Virgin Mary (cf. "him the Head and you faithful"), are not part of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Such an error proves that the "dictations" and "visions" alleged by Maria Valtorta do not come from God; they are not "supernatural."

455.5 [Jesus to Mary] *"And you, pray for Me at the hour of death (...) you and I will save them despite Satan's snares (...) I give you My inheritance (...) My Church, and I*

I entrust to you (...) You, during the time you remain on earth, coming after Peter in the ecclesiastical hierarchy [Italian: Tu, nel tempo che resterai sulla Terra, seconda a Pietro come gerarchia ecclesiastica], he the Head and you faithful (...) July 8, 1946. T6ch147. T7ch455.

Theological Error No. 139: Souls pre-exist in God's mind and are "infused" "afterwards"
"when the time comes."

348.10 (...) the soul lives, exists from the moment God thinks it[3]. It is God's Thought that creates it. My Mother's soul has always been thought by God. Therefore, it is eternal in its beauty, into which God has poured all perfection to derive delight and comfort.

Text of Note [3] published on the website maria-valtorta.org: (...) Maria Valtorta wrote the following on a typed copy: "But the soul actually already has a life from the moment God thinks it. God's thought creates it, then, when the time comes to infuse it." Mary's soul is not created but conceived from all eternity by the divine Thought, which created it when the time came to infuse it into the conceived body. The creation and infusion of the soul are two acts that take place at the same time, as explained in the note in "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" 290.9." December *2,* 1945. T5ch36. T5ch348.

The Valtortist editor contradicts himself from one line to the next. First he quotes Maria Valtorta, who specifies that creation and infusion are separated in time, then he writes that the two acts are accomplished at the same time. The pre-existence of souls in Maria Valtorta is one of the doctrinal errors that led to the condemnation of her writings by the Church.

Theological Error No. 140: The soul only contracts original sin when it is infused into the body.

290.9 (...) the soul (...) emerges perfect from the divine thought and, at the moment of its creation, is similar, for a thousandth of a second, to that of the first man: a perfection that understands the Truth as a result of a freely given gift. A thousandth of a second. Then, once formed, it is wounded by original sin [1].

Text of Note [1] maria-valtorta.org: (...) "these are not two moments, but two acts that follow one another 'in a thousandth of a second', at the same moment. The second act—that in which the soul contracts the stain of original sin and loses the perfection received through the act of Creation—must be identified with the infusion of the soul, as stated at the beginning of the parable of the torn garment (in "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" 567.3), and as explained in a passage from the "dictation" of January 28, 1947 (...) : it does not come out impure from the Creative Thought. Original sin is found in man and in the children of man, not in God. That is why it is not at the moment of its creation by God but at the moment of its incarnation in the man conceived by man that the soul contracts the inheritance shared by the descendants of Adam. September 29, 1945. T4ch154. T4ch290.

This story of a thousandth of a second when the human soul exists without original sin is an error of Catholic faith.

Theological Error No. 141: The soul pre-exists without original sin, then it is stained by original sin.

275.12: "There was at least one moment when the soul was perfect: while God was creating it... then original sin defiled it, taking away its perfection." Vision Sept. 8, 1945. T4ch139. T4ch275.

Theological Error No. 142: "God begets only another Himself."

487.6 (...) God begets only another Himself, for the Perfect can only beget a Perfect, another Being similar to Himself, so as not to debase His perfection by generating a creature inferior to Himself. Sept. 4, 1946. T7ch182. T7ch487.

The relationship of begetting exists only between the Persons of the Holy Trinity, but God does not beget another God.

Theological Error No. 143: Jesus performs a miracle before a pagan woman to prove that he has not "lost his power."

563.4 (...) Claudia Procula [a Roman pagan] (...) 563.5 (...) arrives where Jesus is (...) "Do you also know what they say: that because of your sins you have lost all power and that is why you live here, rejected?" (...) 563.6 – This is your mute slave, isn't he? "Yes, Master." "Bring him forward." (...) The man comes forward and prostrates himself on the ground between Jesus and his mistress (...) "So, for you, I am God?" "Yes... or at least God is with you." (...) Look. And you, lift up your head and open your mouth, O man (...) And by the will of the true, one God, Creator of perfect bodies

perfect, have what man has taken from you." He put his white finger into the mute man's open mouth (...) Jesus took his finger out, crying, "Speak, and use the part that has been reborn to praise the true God." And suddenly (...) a cry responded: "Jesus!" and the black man fell to the ground weeping with joy and licked, truly licked the bare feet of Jesus, as a grateful dog might do. "Have I lost my power, Domina? To those who insinuate this, give this answer (...) 563.7 – You may withdraw, domina, there is nothing more to say." (...) February 7, 1947. T8ch24. T9ch563.

It should be noted that Jesus does not bother to enlighten the pagan Procula, who vacillates between "you are God" and "God is with you." Jesus lets her leave with only this revelation that he has not "lost his power." In the temptation of Jesus in the desert, Satan asked him to perform miracles to prove that he was the Son of God, and Jesus refused. Here, it is enough to insinuate a loss of the power to perform miracles for Jesus to satisfy the request.

Theological Error No. 144: God must be more perfect than man.

571.2 (...) *I am the Savior. As God, I must be more perfect than man.* March 1, 1947. T8ch32. T9ch571. Problem pointed out by G. Chevallier.

This sentence is theologically incorrect because saying that God "must be more perfect than man" implies a scale of perfection where God and man are comparable, which is theologically inaccurate. God's perfection is of a totally different ontological order than that of man. There is an infinite distance between the Creator and the creature; divine perfection is beyond all human measure, it transcends all limits.

Theological Error No. 145: Jesus' prayer is not always answered

because Jesus prays for Judas to be saved and for Judas not to be the traitor, yet Judas was the traitor and is damned because of his despair (and not because of his betrayal). There is consensus among the Church Fathers in the interpretation of the Gospel verses where Jesus affirms Judas' damnation: "One of us is a demon" (John 6 :71);
"Woe to that man (...) it would have been better for him if he had never been born" (Matthew 26:24); "none of them is lost except the son of perdition" (John 17:12).

Theological Error No. 146: Insulting insinuation against Mary: her desire was to possess Jesus for herself alone: "So many hours to possess you for myself alone."

Love is self-giving, and Mary understood and lived this perfectly. She is the opposite of the self-centered possessive mother who would try to steal moments with her child for herself alone.

517.16 (...) "I will help you, my Son. Perhaps the will will be reborn in him?" [referring to Judas]
"No, Mother. But we must act as if... Heaven can do anything, Mother!"
"Yes. And I can still have illusions. Not you, my Son. You know, my Holy Son! But I will always imitate you. Go and be at peace, my love! Even when you can no longer speak to him because he will flee from you, I will try to bring him to you. May only the Most Holy Father hear my suffering... Will you let me pray with you, Jesus? We will pray together, and those hours will be mine alone with you..." (...) March 5, 1947. T8ch36. T9ch517.
Father Guillaume Chevallier points out that this "But we

must do as if" is theologically problematic.

Theological Error No. 147: Jesus in a solitary prayer says: "Ah! I am delirious!"

582.14 (...) Father (...) have mercy on Me—leave in Me the hope of saving him still (...) that I may do something, even for him... Ah! I am delirious! It is the man who wants to have this hope! (...) March 19, 1947. T8ch43. T9ch582.

Jesus' perfection implies that his passions (emotions, affects) were always in perfect harmony with his reason and will, which were themselves perfectly ordered to the divine will. Jesus cannot rave, nor can he say that he is raving. It is a serious lack of respect towards him to write the contrary, because raving implies a disorder of reason or a loss of control, which would be incompatible with the perfect nature of Jesus. The notion of delirium implies a disorderly loss of mental lucidity or a disorderly loss of emotional lucidity. But Jesus had perfect control over his consciousness. Jesus' human consciousness lived in perfect union with his heavenly Father; he knew continually who he was and what he had come to accomplish by becoming incarnate.

Therefore, Jesus cannot possibly "delude himself," but neither can he lie and say, "I am deluding myself." Because of his perfection and virtue, Christ cannot be subject to culpable ignorance, illusion, or internal error. According to Catholic belief, Jesus has always been fully in control of his faculties, including his passions.

<u>On Jesus' perfect mastery of his passions:</u>
Excerpts from the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas, Tertia Pars, q.15, article 4:

-Passions, in the sense of disordered movements of the sensitive appetite, never existed in Christ.
-The soul of Christ could resist passions and prevent them from reaching him, especially through divine virtue; but the soul of Christ submitted of its own will to bodily passions as well as to animal passions.
-The soul of Christ was subject to bodily suffering; it had animal passions, but not in the same way as other men; for they were not directed toward forbidden things, they did not prevent the judgment of the rational soul, but followed it and did not hinder reason in any way.

-These passions were in Christ in a different way than in us, in three respects:

1° As regards their object: because in us these passions are usually directed towards what is unlawful, which did not happen in Christ.

2° As regards their principle, because these passions often prevent the judgment of reason in us, whereas in Christ all the movements of the sensitive appetite arose in accordance with the disposition of this faculty. From this, St. Augustine remarks that, thanks to their certain dispensation, Christ did not receive these affections in his human heart until he willed it, just as he became man when he willed it.

3° As for their effect, because in us these movements sometimes do not stop at the sensitive appetite, but carry reason along with them, which did not happen in Christ; for the movements that are natural to the body stopped at the sensitive appetite, so that reason was in no way prevented from doing what was right. This is what St. Jerome says (*Sup. Matth.,*

sup. illud chap. 26: *Cœpit contristari*), that Our Lord, to prove that he had truly become man, was truly saddened; but lest anyone believe that passion had taken control of his mind, it is said, by *propassion*, that he began to be saddened. For there is perfect passion when the mind or reason is dominated, and there is *propassion* when the affection begins in the sensitive appetite but does not extend beyond it.

Theological Error No. 148: "Woman must redeem, as Man redeems."

587.7 (...) The even poorer world needs two Victims. Because Man sinned with Woman, Woman must redeem, as Man redeems (...) Vision March 2, 1945. T9ch6. T9ch587.
This statement is an error because Mary collaborates in the Redemption in an essentially different way than her Son, who is true God and true man.

Theological Error No. 149: "The translators always write 'on [this stone]'. But I clearly said against [this stone], not on [this stone]." Matthew 21:44.

False, because the Greek manuscripts all say "on this stone." Father Guillaume Chevallier: "The Greek text uses epi [επι], which is indisputably translated as 'on.'" Under the guise of science, Valtorta's Jesus attacks the Catholic Church's power to faithfully transmit the words of Jesus. Where are the true words of Jesus? In Valtorta or in the canonical Gospels? "The Gospel as it was revealed to me" teaches distrust of the Catholic Church, which it declares incapable of faithfully transmitting the Revelation made by God in Jesus Christ.

594.8 – Jesus said to me: "As I pointed out to you the expression 'at my cup' in the vision where the mother of John and James asks for a place for her sons ["The Gospel as Revealed to Me" 377.11], I draw your attention, in yesterday's vision, to the passage: 'Whoever falls against this stone will be broken. ["The Gospel as Revealed to Me" 592.17.]" Translators always write "on." But I clearly said against, not on (...). April 1, 1947. T9ch13. T9ch594.

In the following list are rationalist, Jewish, Protestant, Catholic, and Jehovah's Witness Bibles; yet all translate "will fall on." If no translator translates "will fall against," it is because no manuscript of the Gospel contains "will fall against." If it was Jesus speaking to Maria Valtorta, he would have known this and would not have taken the risk of being easily contradicted by anyone who speaks Greek and is familiar with the books giving the variants of the Greek manuscripts on this verse of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. To date, no Hebrew or Aramaic manuscript has ever been found for the Gospels.

43 translations published between 1535 and 2024:
2024 Bible of Rome: whoever falls on this stone will be broken
2022 New Crampon Bible: whoever falls on this stone will be broken
2019 New French Bible: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
2018 Jehovah's Witnesses Bible: Moreover, whoever falls on this stone will be broken
2015 Alain Dumont Literal Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be shattered
2013 Official Liturgical Bible: And everyone who falls on this stone will be broken to pieces.
2010 Ecumenical Translation of the Bible: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken

2007 Translation by Tresmontant: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken
2007 Segond 21 Bible: Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken
2005 Bible des Peuples: As for the stone, whoever falls on it will be broken
2002 New Segond Bible: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
2000 Bible Parole de vie: If anyone falls on this stone, his body will be broken
2000 Bible du Semeur: Anyone who falls on this stone will break their neck
1997 Maredsous Bible: Whoever stumbles on this stone will be broken
1995 Jehovah's Witnesses Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken.
1994 King James Version: And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken
1982 Bible in Everyday Language: Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken
1980 Official Liturgical Bible: And everyone who falls on this stone will be broken
1980 ACÉBAC Gospels: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1978 Bible à la Colombe: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1977 Chouraqui Bible: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1976 Ecumenical Translation of the Bible: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1973 Osty Trinquet Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be shattered
1973 Jerusalem Bible: Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken to pieces.
1953 Pirot Clamer Bible: Whoever falls on this stone
1950 Tamisier Amiot Bible: Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken

1923 Crampon Bible: whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1921 Synodal Bible: Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken
1910 Louis Segond Bible: Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken
1900 Glaire Vigouroux Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1899 Annotated Bible of Neufchâtel: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken.
1895 Fillion Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken to pieces.
1889 Stapfer Bible: Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken to pieces.
1887 Henri Lasserre Gospel: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1885 John Nelson Darby Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1881 Ostervald Bible: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1874 Oltramare Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1866 Bourassé & Janvier Bible: Whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1858 Albert Rilliet Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken to pieces
1851 Lamennais Bible: And whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1759 Bible Lemaistre de Sacy: Whoever lets himself fall on this stone will be broken
1744 David Martin Bible: But whoever falls on this stone will be broken
1535 Bible Pierre-Robert Olivetan: But whoever falls on this stone
source: http://djep.hd.free.fr/LaReferenceBiblique/?Trad=1&Livre=40&Chap=21&Vers=44

Theological Error No. 150: Jesus throws in the towel, he gives up, disgusted by the condemnation of Maria Valtorta's writings.

Jesus, being God made man, has known from all eternity, before the first word dictated to Maria Valtorta, how His Holy Church (which He Himself has charged with discerning private revelations, locutions, miracles, etc.) will judge *the Gospel as revealed to me* and the other writings of Valtorta. Therefore, such a statement reinforces the analysis that it is not Jesus who is speaking to Valtorta. Furthermore, the sentence of May 21, 1946, could imply that Jesus would no longer appear anywhere until the end of the world since "the Gospel as it was revealed to me" has not been approved by his Church.

640.8 - And at the end of the Work, I must once again make the complaint that I made at the end of each evangelical year, and in the pain of seeing my gift despised, I say to you: "You will have nothing else, since you have not known how to accept what I have given you." And I also tell you what I made you say to remind you of the right path last summer (on May 21, 1946, in the Cahiers, Jesus said): "You will not see me until the day comes when you say, 'Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord. Vision of Sunday, April 27, 1947. T10ch25. T10ch640.

Theological Error No. 151: Jesus, resurrected, weeps.

632.5 [Jesus with Judas' mother] *(...) Jesus has two tears in the corners of his very gentle eyes. They surprise me greatly. I did not think that Jesus could still cry after he was resurrected... (...) Jesus' two tears fall on his face, which is flushed with fever. "I have purified you, Mary. My tears of pity are upon you. I have not cried for anyone since I consumed my pain.*

But I weep over you with all my loving pity."
Visions April 16 and 17, 1947. T10ch18. T10ch632

The resurrected bodies of the elect can no longer be sad or suffer. To imagine a resurrected Jesus weeping is an error that undermines the glorious nature of the resurrected bodies. Jesus can no longer suffer physically or experience grief or sadness as he did before his resurrection. Suffering and sadness are incompatible with the glorious state of the elect; the resurrection freed Jesus from the imperfections and weaknesses that he did not have in himself but chose to bear out of love for us.

Theological Error No. 152: Satan incarnated himself in Judas.

600.32 (...) why did you also choose a traitor? (...) "Do not ask yourselves who this man is. He is not a man, he is Satan. (...) It is Satan. If Satan, the eternal monkey of God, had not incarnated himself in mortal flesh, this possessed man would not have been able to escape my power as Jesus. I said 'possessed', but no, he is much more than that. He is annihilated in Satan. (...) "But why didn't you defeat him? Couldn't you?" "Yes, I could have. But to prevent Satan from incarnating to kill me, I would have had to exterminate the human race before the Redemption. What would I have redeemed in that case?"

Satan did not incarnate himself in Judas, and it makes no sense to say that God could not prevent Satan from incarnating himself in one or all human beings. God can very easily forbid Satan from doing this. Satan is a creature entirely subject to God. In chapter 1 of the book of Job, we read that even to tempt Job, he is obliged to ask God's permission. The book of Revelation, the 73rd and last book of the Bible, also shows us Satan defeated and chained.

To assert that Satan incarnated himself in Judas is a serious doctrinal error incompatible with the Catholic faith, because it contradicts the uniqueness of the Incarnation, denies Judas' human freedom and personal identity. It introduces a false theology of evil. The concept of the Incarnation is a mystery reserved solely for God. To claim that Satan incarnated himself in Judas is to imitate or counterfeit the mystery of the Incarnation, which would be theologically unacceptable.

Theological Error No. 153: Jesus tells Judas that he is God and his creator.

567.16 (...) You do not want to obey Me, I do not say Me as a man, but even Me as God, you have obeyed Satan. (...) You were placed before Good and Evil. You chose Evil. And yet you were placed only before Good, Me. The Eternal One, your Creator, who has followed the evolution of your soul, who even knew this evolution (...) placed you before Good, only before Good, because He knows that you are weak (...) February 15, 1947. T8ch28. T9ch567.

This idea that Jesus would have let Judas know that he is God makes no sense because Judas said when he returned the thirty pieces of silver: "I have betrayed innocent blood." He never knew that Jesus was God. Judas was one of the Zealots. He became an apostle out of human ambition to lead the new Israel, which was to be ruled by the Messiah after militarily defeating the Roman occupiers. His plan was to provoke a violent reaction from Jesus if he was arrested and, at the same time, he counted on Jesus' mercy if his plan failed, but in any case, a poor and mortified life as a preacher of the Gospel never interested him. He loved money and power and probably had the vices (gluttony, lust) that go with them. Maria Valtorta

does nothing to help understand the mystery of Judas, nor to describe a so-called descent into evil, since according to her, Judas is vicious from the outset and ends up no longer being responsible for his actions because Satan takes control, until this idea heretical of an
"incarnation," an idea deeply opposed to Christian doctrine, which the Holy Office noticed as early as the
. It should be noted that the Valtortists do not deny Satan's incarnation in Judas, but rather that possession and incarnation are identical. The Church teaches that Judas was personally responsible and not possessed by demons, a process during which the possessed person does not bear moral responsibility for the acts committed by demons during episodes of possession.

Theological Error No. 154: Jesus loved Judas more than Saint John.

Theological Error No. 155: Judas did not have God in his heart.

Theological Error No. 156: Judas is "the damned deicide."

630.22 (...) who, like Judas, was loved by Me? But he did not have Me-God in his heart. And he is the damned deicide, infinitely guilty as an Israelite and as a disciple, as a suicide and as a deicide, in addition to his seven deadly sins and all his other faults (...). Vision April 11, 1947. T10ch16. T10ch630.

Judas is damned because of his despair. Despair is one of the six sins against the Holy Spirit, meaning that it is a sin that directly attacks God's mercy. His intention was not to have Jesus killed, but to provoke a political uprising with Jesus at its head

to free Israel from Roman occupation. Judas wanted power. "The Gospel as it was revealed to me" does not help us understand the mystery of Judas, contrary to the claims of "Farewell to the Work." The Judas described by Maria Valtorta is a literary fiction that is irreconcilable with the real Judas of the Gospels.

Theological Error No. 157: Woe to Judas for being the traitor.

106.9 (...) Woe to him for being the traitor! But a traitor was needed. Full of duplicity, cunning, greedy, thirsty for lust, a thief, but also more intelligent and more cultured than most (...) to hold the purse and approach women. Two things he loved in an unbridled way, not to mention his taste for honors (...). Vision February 13, 1944. T2ch73. T2ch106.

Judas' damnation is caused by his despair, not by his betrayal. The Good Thief was probably a murderer and a rapist, crimes that are misfortunes in themselves, but he is saved.

Theological Error No. 158: Deleting part of John 13:27

In chapter 600.17, Valtorta omits (without informing the reader) this part of verse 27 of chapter 13 of the Gospel according to St. John: "When Judas had taken the morsel, Satan entered into him."

The entire verse 27 is as follows: "When Judas had taken the morsel, Satan entered into him, and Jesus said to him, 'What you are doing, do quickly.'"

You will need to read the chapter to see this omission or

a keyword search on websites that publish Maria Valtorta's entire work free of charge (in Italian and French. Such a website probably exists in other languages, but we do not have this information at this time).
See March 9, 1945. T9ch19. T9ch600 et seq.

(Omission pointed out by Don Guillaume Chevallier in his article on Maria Valtorta's doctrinal errors).

"Entering" and "incarnating" are not the same thing. The Church has never taught that Judas was the incarnation of Satan or that Satan incarnated himself in Judas, which would be to deny any personal responsibility on Judas' part in his betrayal and suicide out of despair. Satan can enter bodily into man through demonic possession. Only God can enter into the mind of man. Satan cannot do so; he has no access to the interior of the human mind. God within us gives us our being through his power. Without the continuous presence of God within us, our being would collapse and disappear into nothingness.

Satan enters us when we follow the evil he suggests to us, when we are seduced by his suggestion and when we carry out that evil. Malice is the disposition of our mind to do evil, and that is how it entered Judas. Earlier, it is said that Satan put into Judas' heart the plan to betray Jesus. Here it is said that Satan enters Judas: it is the same plan, with only a change in the intensity of Judas' malice. First, this temptation is accepted by Judas, then it is perfectly accepted and desired, fully and without reservation. The planned act is the same, only the malice changes in its new intensity. First Satan tempts us, he throws into our hearts the idea of committing a sin. We can accept this temptation with more or less doubt and hesitation. And if we totally consent to the idea of committing this sin, we can say that Satan enters into us because we have made his malice our own.

proposed. Satan entered Judas before the bite (Luke) to incite betrayal, and after the bite (John) Satan entered Judas again to carry out the betrayal to the end and complete it. These different stages of the process demonstrate that Satan was not at home in Judas and that it was Judas' heart that evolved, deliberated, and then firmly decided to betray Jesus.

Theological Error No. 159: Changing "What you are doing, do it quickly" (John 13:27).

600.17 "Good! Go, now that I have pleased you," Jesus said to Judas. "Everything is accomplished here (he emphasized this word strongly). What you have to do elsewhere, do quickly, Judas, son of Simon.
"I will obey you immediately, Master. I will join you later in Gethsemane. That is where you are going, as always, isn't it?" "I am going there... as always... yes." (...) "Let him go. He and I know what he must do (...)
March 9, 1945. T9ch19. T9ch600 et seq.

This dialogue raises several issues: first, the sentence
"It is finished," said Jesus on the cross just before his death, becomes a repetition of a phrase that would have been said in the Upper Room with the idea that the "here" of the Upper Room is more important than Golgotha, yet Redemption was accomplished on the Cross and not in the Upper Room. Then, Judas' explicit words, "I will do it right away, Master," reinforce the idea that "do it quickly" is not only Jesus' permission for evil but also his positive will that Judas betray him and hand him over to his enemies in the Sanhedrin. Jesus cannot ask Judas to do evil; he did not command him to betray him and hand him over.

This is the true text according to John 13:27:As soon as Judas took it, Satan entered into him, and Jesus said to him, "What you are doing,

Do it quickly." [28]None of those at the table understood why he said this to him. [29]Some thought that, since Judas had the money bag, Jesus was telling him, "Buy what we need for the festival," or "Give something to the poor." ([30]) Judas took the piece of bread and hurried out. It was night. ([31]) When Judas had gone out, Jesus said, "Now the Son of Man has been glorified, and God has been glorified in him (...).

Theological Error No. 160: Omitting (without informing the reader) John 13:2 "The devil had already put it into the heart of Judas, son of Simon Iscariot, to betray him."

This verse contradicts the error of Satan's incarnation in Judas, since it was not Satan incarnate but the free will of Judas' heart that made the decision; it was not Satan. March 9, 1945. T9ch19. T9ch600. Omission in chapter 600.17. Error reported by Don Guillaume Chevallier.

Theological Error No. 161: At the Last Supper, Jesus said, "You have seen the Transubstantiation."

600.19 - I can do anything I ask. You have seen it. All I had to do was desire it, and the Father granted the Son to give himself as food for man. March 9, 1945. T9ch19. T9ch600.

This miracle of transubstantiation can be believed, but, except for the Eucharistic miracle, it cannot be seen since the species of bread and wine retain the same appearance, the same taste, and the same physical or physical-chemical properties.

Error Theological No. 162: Jesus refers to as "spiritual essence of the second Person."

600.20 [Jesus speaks of himself before the apostles after the Last Supper:] *Rejoice, you who return to your Seat, O spiritual essence of the second Person! Rejoice, O flesh that will rise again after such a long exile in the mire! March 9, 1945. T9ch19. T9ch600.*

Jesus is the divine essence: One, Unique, whole, complete, perfect, total. The Word is the second Person of the Holy Trinity, but it is wrong to write that he is the spiritual essence of the second Person. In Catholic theology, a distinction is made between the divine essence, which is One, Unique (God is One, Unique), and the Persons. The Word is not a "spiritual essence" but the divine Person of the Son who subsists in the one divine Essence, common to the Father and the Holy Spirit. The Three are one God. The divine essence of the Word is God in his entirety. God never left Heaven, even during the Incarnation.

Theological Error No. 163: The entire chapter 17 of the Gospel according to St. John disappears.

600.37 - Jesus rises, opens his arms in a cross and, with a luminous face, says the sublime prayer to the Father. John reports it in its entirety. March 9, 1945. T9ch19. T9ch600.

One of the reasons for "the gift of the Work to our time" (April 28, 1947) is to "reawaken love for the Gospel": in that case, shouldn't the entire chapter 17 have been included? It is one of the most beautiful chapters of the Gospel. In order for the reader to understand the seriousness of this omission, we are publishing chapter 17 (and we recommend that the reader refer to the website http://jesusmarie.com/verset.html to read the verse-by-verse explanations by the Fathers and

Doctors of the Church, the great ecclesiastical authors):

John 17. [1] Having said this, Jesus lifted his eyes to heaven and said, "Father, the hour has come. Glorify your Son, so that your Son may glorify you,
[2] You have given him authority over all flesh, that he may give eternal life to all whom you have given him.
[3] And this is eternal life, that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent.
([4])I have glorified you on earth, I have finished the work you gave me to do.
[5] And now, Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory I had with you before the world began.
[6]I have made your name known to the people whom you gave me out of the world. They were yours, and you gave them to me, and they have kept your word.
[7] They know that everything you gave me is from you,
[8] for I have given them the words you gave me, and they have received them and truly understood that I came from you, and they have believed that you sent me.
[9] I pray for them. I do not pray for the world, but for those whom you have given me, because they are yours.
[10] For everything that is mine is yours, and everything that is yours is mine, and I am glorified in them.
[11] I am no longer in the world. For them, they are in the world, and I am coming to you. Holy Father, keep in your name those whom you have given me, so that they may be one, as we are one.
[12] When I was with them, I kept them in your name. I have kept those whom you gave me, and none of them has been lost, except the son of perdition, so that the Scripture might be fulfilled.

13 Now I am coming to you, and I say this while I am in the world,
so that they may have in themselves my perfect joy.
14I have given them your word, and the world has hated them
because they are not of the world, just as I am not of the world.
15 I do not ask you to take them out of the world, but to keep
them from evil.
16They are not of the world, just as I am not of the world.
17 Sanctify them in the truth: your word is truth. 18
As you sent me into the world, I also send them into the world.
19And I sanctify myself for them, that they also may be sanctified in
truth.
20 I do not pray for them only, but also for those who will believe
in me through their preaching.
21 That they may all be one, just as you, Father, are in me, and I
in you, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe
that you sent me.
22 And I have given them the glory that you gave me, that they
may be one, even as we are one, I in them and you in me.
23 That they may be perfectly one, so that the world may know
that you sent me and loved them even as you loved me.
24Father, I want those you have given me to be with me where I
am, so that they may see the glory you have given me because
you loved me before the creation of the world.
25 Father, the world has not known you, but I have known you,
and these have known that you sent me.
26 And I have made your name known to them, and I will make it
known, so that the love with which you loved me may be in them,
and I in them."

See *The New Crampon Bible*, amazon.fr, Dec. 17, 2022.

Theological Error No. 164: The risen Jesus still suffers because of Judas.

634.6 (...) Remember again that I did not refuse Judas himself (...) I did not ignore Judas' horror (…)
634.7 - But you suffer, Lord? Oh! I did not believe that you could still suffer! You still suffer for Judas! (...)" cries John (...) Jesus opens his arms in his usual gesture of resigned confirmation of a painful fact. (…)
"It is so... Judas was and is the greatest pain in the sea of my pains. It is the pain that remains... The other sufferings ended with the end of the Sacrifice. But this one remains (...) the place of horror was closed upon him. For him, my death was in vain (...) no one would have imagined that he could still suffer! they all say to one another." (...) "Do you not think of the pain that my heart will still have to endure throughout the centuries, for every unrepentant sinner (...)
Vision April 20, 1947. T10ch20. T10ch634.

On the contrary, the Catholic faith says that the resurrected body can no longer suffer, which theology calls the gift of impassibility of the resurrected bodies of those who escape eternal damnation and will spend eternity in Paradise. The glorious resurrected never suffer again, they enjoy bliss, that torrent of delights (cf. Hebrew Psalm 36:9).

Indecency No. 139: Mary kisses Jesus on the mouth.

Indecency No. 140: Instead of talking or hugging each other, there is a cascade of kisses everywhere.

Infantilization of the Virgin Mary, presented in EMV as perpetually thirsty for kisses and caresses.

Theological error No. 165: The joy of the risen Jesus is incomplete; he is missing a kiss from his mother on his heart.

618.2 (...) Mary (...) kisses him and kisses him, laughing through her tears. She kisses his forehead (...) his head (...) his eyes (...) his cheeks (...) his mouth, which is no longer swollen (...) she takes his hands and kisses the tops and palms (...) and suddenly bows down at his feet (...) and kisses them. 618.3 Then she stands up, looks at him, and dares not speak. But He smiles and understands. He opens His garment at the chest and says: "And that one, Mother, don't you kiss her, the one who hurt you so much and whom you alone are worthy to kiss? Kiss me on the Heart, Mother. Your kiss will take away the last memory of all that is pain and give me that joy which is still lacking in my Joy as the Risen One." (...) She kisses him, kisses him while Jesus caresses her. She never tires of kissing him. She looks like a thirsty person who has attached her mouth to the spring and is drinking the life that was slipping away from her. Vision Feb. 21, 1944. T10ch4 T10ch618.

Theological Error No. 166: Jesus' distressing and prosaic words at the magnificent moment of his first appearance to his Mother after his resurrection. Mary did not understand; he had to explain to her what had happened.

Theological Error No. 167: Mary "conceived" Jesus.

618.4 Now Jesus speaks. "It is finished, Mother. Now you must not weep for your Son. The trial is over. Redemption has come. Mother, thank you for conceiving me, raising me, and helping me in life and in death. Vision Feb. 21, 1944. T10ch4. T10ch618.

The Apostles' Creed says: "conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary." Mary did not "conceive" Jesus; she gave her consent to this miraculous conception, but she is not its author. She carried Jesus, she gave birth to Jesus, she is the Mother of God because she gave birth to Jesus, true God and true man, but she is not the author of the "conception" of Jesus.

Theological Error No. 168: The Persons of the Holy Trinity are parts of God.

Theological Error No. 169: If one honors one Person of the Holy Trinity, one does not honor "the whole" Trinity.

225.8 (...) Know that if you separate the Father from the Son, or the Son from the Father, and do not remember Love, you do not love God as He should be loved: with truth and wisdom, but you commit heresy because you honor only one of Them, whereas They are an admirable Trinity. Therefore, whoever does not honor the Son is like one who does not honor the Father, for the Father, God, does not accept <u>that only one part of Himself</u> be adored, but He wants His Whole to be adored. (...) Italian: perché il Padre, Dio, non accetta che <u>una sola parte di Sé</u> sia adorata, ma vuole sia adorato il suo Tutto. Vision July 21, 1945. T4ch87. T3ch225.
Catechism of the Catholic Church § 253: "Divine persons

divine persons do not share the one divinity, but each of them is God in its entirety." Each person is not a part or a portion of God. The Word is not a part of God, the Holy Spirit is not a part of God, the Father is not a part of God. God is One, Unique, Undivided. Each person is perfect, whole, and complete God. "The Gospel as it has been revealed to me" contradicts the doctrine of divine simplicity (God has no parts) and that of the indivisibility of the divine essence.

If we honor God the Son, do we honor the entire Trinity? (Valtorta writes the opposite) Yes, honoring the Son is honoring the entire Trinity, and it is theologically incorrect to write that honoring one person of the Trinity is not honoring the entire Trinity, because the Catholic faith professes that God is one in nature, substance, and essence, but exists in three persons: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. These three persons are one Godhead, their glory is equal, and their majesty is coeternal. Since the Trinity is an indivisible unity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are united in one Godhead. It is heretical to confuse the persons or to divide the one divine substance. The Son and the Holy Spirit are consubstantial with the Father, which means that they share the same divine substance. There is only one divinity according to nature. In the Trinity, nothing is before or after, nothing is greater or lesser. The three persons are coeternal and equal. Thus, to honor the Son is to honor God, for the Son is God, just as the Father and the Holy Spirit are God.

Theological Error No. 170: Mary merited for Jesus the power to accomplish Redemption.

599.4 (...) "Mother, I have come to draw strength and comfort from you. [On a psychological and emotional level, this is possible for Jesus as a man, although Jesus also found strength and comfort in prayer to his

Father] *Mother (...) I have only you.* [Is the Father absent?] *(...) You are faithful to me and you are my strength, Mother, at this hour. Support me with your love and your prayers (...) Just as through your prayers you drew upon yourself the Spirit of God, to give to the world through Him the One whom the nations await, so now draw upon your Son the strength that will help me accomplish the work for which I have come (...)* Vision February 17, 1944. T9ch18.T9ch299.

We submitted this doctrinal error to one of our greatest contemporary theologians (who was notably a member of the International Theological Commission) and his response was: "As for the thesis that the Virgin Mary merited anything for her Son, it is indeed absurd."

The Virgin Mary cannot merit anything for her Son because Christ is not dependent on any external force that Mary could attract to him, since Christ-God is the author of grace. This statement diminishes the divine power of Christ. Mary cooperates in a unique way, but she is not a co-author of redemption.

This error is found in another passage where Jesus says that redemption was not accomplished at his death but after his Mother's three days of suffering. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* speaks of Mary's "subordinate role," which "only highlights the unique mediation of the Redeemer." Mary does not obtain from God what He gives to Christ to accomplish redemption.

She accompanies him perfectly, she understands God's plan perfectly (whereas the Virgin Mary described by Valtorta rebels at the foot of the cross and asks for a miracle to stop the Passion, protesting that it was not necessary for Jesus to suffer so much). Mary unites herself to the suffering of her Son, but she does not make

possible what he accomplishes by himself. Jesus as a man alone merited supernatural grace.

It is Jesus who merited for Mary, not Mary who obtained supernatural graces for Jesus. As a man, he is supported by the tenderness and love of his mother, but this sentence is impossible: "Now draw upon your Son the strength that helps me to accomplish the work for which I came," because it was Jesus who obtained for Mary the supernatural grace not to falter during the Passion, the grace to cooperate perfectly as co-redemptrix; it is not the other way around.

One is God, the other is a creature, saved by God, preserved from original sin by God. The Virgin Mary did not save herself, nor did she save Jesus as a man. We must not believe that saying anything about the Virgin Mary is respectful towards her; on the contrary, it is a vicious and hypocritical way of belittling and ridiculing her.

Theological Error No. 171: Contradicting the verses relating to the resurrection of Lazarus.

Theological Error No. 172: "The Master is here, he is calling you" disappears.

548.2 (...) Jesus prefers to take a small path behind the village so that he can reach Lazarus' house without attracting the attention of the inhabitants (...)

548.3 - Here they are at the garden gate (...) Jesus sets foot at the edge of the garden (...) Jesus enters very slowly (...) 548.4 - Martha comes out of the house in the midst of a group of Jews who have come to visit, among whom are Elchias

and Sadoq. She shields her eyes, tired from crying, from the light so she can see where Jesus is. She sees him. She breaks away from those accompanying her and runs toward Jesus, a few steps from the pool (...) 548.5 - "Now I'll go tell Mary," and she quickly walks away, disappearing into the house. (...) Vision December 26, 1946. T8ch8. T8ch548.

In "The Gospel According to My Revelation," the conversation between Jesus and Martha takes place in the presence of the Pharisees, and Jesus is in Lazarus' garden. Whereas in the Gospel, Jesus did not enter Lazarus' property (John 11 (30) *For Jesus had not yet entered the village, but was still in the place where Martha had met him)* and the conversation with Martha takes place without the Pharisees being present, since it is said: (28) When she had said this, she went away and called her sister Mary in secret, saying, "The Teacher is here and is calling for you." (29) As soon as she heard this, she got up quickly and went to him. (30) For Jesus had not yet entered the village, but was still in the place where Martha had met him. (31) The Jews who were with Mary and had been consoling her, seeing her rise quickly and go out, followed her, thinking, "She is going to the tomb to weep there." If the Jews had already been present when Jesus met Martha, she could not have called her sister "in secret"; furthermore, the Jews would not have said, "She is going to the tomb to weep," since they knew that Jesus was there and that Mary Magdalene loved Jesus, and they would have understood that she was also going to see Jesus.

There are probably other problems or errors in the account of the resurrection of Lazarus in "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," but we will suspend our criticism here.

Theological Error #173: Distorting the Parable of the Ten Virgins.

206.2 (...) While the bride and groom, with their parents and friends, were enjoying themselves in the bride's house, ten young girls went to their places in the vestibule of the groom's house (...) July 1, 1945. T3ch67. T3ch206.

Valtorta invents a problem of crumpled clothes, torn veils, and garlands that have been undone or lost, none of which exist in la véritable parabole évangélique. Jésus dit "vigilance, vigilance, vigilance," but he does not clarify the various points of interpretation of the Church Fathers, such as the question of what the oil in the lamps represents. In "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," when the bridegroom says "I do not know you" to the foolish virgins, he is about to enter the bridal chamber, whereas in the Gospel, it is the door of his house and the wedding feast (not the wedding night): Matthew 25 ([10]) But while they went to buy it, the bridegroom came, and those who were ready went with him into the wedding hall, and the door was shut.

Theological Error No. 174: Judas, the greatest of all sinners.

Theological Error No. 175: "To forgive Judas would be a sacrilege against my divinity, which he betrayed, and it would be an injustice to all other men."

Jesus said: (...) the greatest of all sinners of humanity, the beloved son of Satan, he who was a thief as the Gospel says, lustful and greedy for human glory (...) Judas Iscariot (...) driven by triple lust (...) became a merchant of the Son of God (…)

for thirty pieces of silver (...) he delivered me into the hands of the executioners (...) he was the sacrilegious one par excellence (...) he was the unjust one par excellence (...) he was the one who contemptuously shed my Blood (...) To forgive Judas would be a sacrilege against my divinity, which he betrayed; it would be an injustice to all other men, who are always less guilty than he and yet are punished for their sins; it would be to despise my blood; finally, it would be to disregard my laws. Catechesis of Saturday, January 15, 1944.

Neither the Magisterium nor any great mystic teaches that Judas was the greatest sinner of all mankind.
To forgive Judas when Judas did not sincerely regret his act would be sacrilegious, but in the exact phrase written by Valtorta, where Judas is presented as the worst sinner of all time, this seems to place a limit on God's mercy. *"O God, You are mercy itself, even for the greatest repentant sinners. The greater the sinner, the more he is entitled to my mercy." (*Saint Faustina, *Little Diary,* No. 422) God forgives sin, but He cannot forgive the will to sin, says Saint Alphonsus Liguori in his book *The Good Death* or *Preparation for Death,* 18th Consideration, On the Number of Sins, 2nd point.
Note: Purgatory is not a place where souls perform acts of love. In purgatory, souls can no longer earn merit. We go to purgatory because we have not sufficiently cleansed ourselves of the stains caused by our sins.

Theological Error No. 176: We see the essence of God at the particular judgment; God is "glimpsed during the particular judgment."

Theological Error No. 177: *One of the torments of hell is to be forever in darkness "after seeing the light of paradise," "after seeing the Light that is God."*

Purgatory is a place where you atone for your lack of love for your Lord God by thinking of Him, whose Essence shone before you at the moment of your particular judgment and filled you with the desire to possess Him. Through love, you conquer Love and, passing through increasing degrees of fiery charity, you wash your clothes until they are pure and luminous, so that you may enter the kingdom of Light (...) Hell is a place where the thought of God, the memory of God glimpsed during the particular judgment, is not, as it is for the soul in purgatory, a holy desire (...) In hell, the thought of God is remorse, resentment, damnation, hatred. Hatred against Satan, hatred against men, hatred against oneself (...) The third torment [of hell] (...) To find oneself forever in darkness after having seen the light of paradise, to be embraced by Darkness after having seen the Light that is God! Catechesis of Saturday, January 15, 1944.

We do not see God at the particular judgment, and the punishment of the damned does not include the fact of having glimpsed God.

Theological Error No. 178: Jesus lacks self-control; he begins to raise his arm to strike Judas, he begins to curse, then refrains from striking and cursing Judas.

Theological Error No. 179: Jesus insults the gold coins: "Satan's trash! Cursed gold! Spit of hell! Serpent's venom!"

567.12 – Jesus closes the door with a bolt (...) He turns around to look at Judas (...) Jesus walks straight toward him (...) I am too scared (...) I see his eyes and I am afraid (...) Judas himself is afraid (...) But when [Jesus] sees that a kind of hook is sticking out of Judas's belt, he has a frightening reaction. He raises his arm with his fist clenched, as if to strike the thief, and his mouth begins to utter the word, "Damned!" But he controls himself. He stops his arm from falling and cuts the word off at the first three letters. And making an effort to control himself that makes him tremble all over, he merely loosens his clenched fist, lowers his raised arm to the height of the purse Judas is holding in his hands, and snatches it away to throw it on the ground, saying in a muffled voice as he tramples on the purse and the coins and scatters them with contained but terrible fury: "Away! Scum of Satan! Cursed gold! Spittle of hell! Serpent's venom! Begone!" Feb. 15, 1947.
T. 8 ch8, T. 9 ch567.

Jesus had perfect control over himself, contrary to what Maria Valtorta describes. He did not have to struggle internally against the inclination to evil that all humans have. Jesus did not have to struggle against lust, so he could not give in to a fit of anger and then repress the physical or verbal violence he would have begun to carry out. There is no
"seat of sin" or "seat of lust" in Jesus. The essence of the seat of sin consists in the resistance of sensual appetite to reason. The seat of sin implies the desire for things that are pleasant contrary to the order of reason. A mind shows its strength by resisting the desires of the flesh that are contrary to reason. And a human mind shows its strength even more if, through virtue, it suppresses

completely the flesh and prevents it from fighting against him.

This was fitting for Christ, whose spirit had reached the highest degree of strength, to such an extent that he did not have to struggle internally against concupiscence, but had to endure externally the attacks of the world and the devil, and by overcoming them he earned the palm of triumph.

The Gospel says (Matthew 1:20): *What is born in her is from the Holy Spirit*. Now, the Holy Spirit excludes sin and the inclination to sin that the word "seat of sin" implies. Therefore, the seat of sin did not exist in Christ. The seat of sin did not exist in Jesus in any way because virtue and grace existed in Christ to the highest degree. Christ had grace and all virtues in the most perfect way. The moral virtue that resides in the irrational part of the soul makes it subject to reason, and this submission is all the more complete the more perfect the virtue is. Thus, temperance subdues the concupiscent, strength and gentleness subdue the irascible, as we have said (1a 2æ, quest. 56, art. 4)..

Since the inclination of the sensual appetite toward what is contrary to reason belongs to the essence of the seat of concupiscence (or seat of sin), it is evident that the more perfect virtue is in someone, the weaker the force of this seat is in him. Thus, since virtue was in Christ in its most perfect degree, it follows that the seat of sin did not exist in him (cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica,* Tertia Pars, q.15, article 2: Was there a seat of sin in Christ?).

Insulting gold coins? Portraying Jesus as someone who lets off steam by hurling a string of insults. Jesus is perfection made man; did he come to teach us how to swear? Especially since, even if 1 Timothy 6:10 teaches that "the love of money is the

source of all evil," gold itself is morally neutral; it is neither good nor evil. All material creatures are essentially good because they were created by God (see Genesis chapter 1).

Theological Error No. 180: Judas tried everything to get himself expelled from the group of the twelve apostles.

Theological Error No. 181: Judas is damned because he did not say to Jesus, "Lord, save me!"

567.12 (...) [Judas:] I want this! To make you chase me away! To make you curse me! To curse me! To curse me! I tried everything to get myself kicked out." (...) Jesus repeated to him in a low but terrible voice: "Thief! Thief! Thief!" and he ends by saying: "Today a thief, tomorrow a murderer. Like Barabbas. Worse than him."

But Jesus explains that he cannot save himself if he casts him out (and at the same time Jesus tells him that he will be damned, that he will not be saved):

567.24 (...) Do you want me to chase you away? No, never. When someone is drowning, the one who lets him go is a murderer. You are between two forces that are pulling you. Satan and Me. But if I leave you, you will have only him. And how will you save yourself? (...)
567.26 (...) Judas (...) bursts into tears, saying, "Cursed am I! I am the scourge of the earth!" [Jesus:] "You are eternally unhappy! (...) If you wanted to, you could still be happy!" "Swear to me, swear to me that no one will know anything.... and I swear to you that I will redeem myself," cries Judas. "Do not say, 'and I will redeem myself.' You cannot. Only I can redeem you (...) Tell me (...) 'Lord, save me!' and I will deliver you from the one who dominates you. Do you not understand

that I am waiting for these words more than my mother's kiss?" Judas weeps and weeps, but he does not say these words (...) From tomorrow, you will keep the money. Everything is useless now." Feb. 15, 1947. Vol. 8, ch. 8, Vol. 9, ch. 567.

Theological Error No. 182: Judas' greatest mistake was to believe that Jesus is God.

Theological Error No. 183: Judas was afraid of falling directly into hell like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram and their followers.

567.16 (…) You were placed before Good and Evil. You chose Evil (…) 567.18 – Because of gold, you became lustful and treacherous..." (…) Do you know before whom you stand? (…) You are not yet so corrupt that you do not believe that I am God, and therein lies your greatest fault. For your fear of my wrath proves that you believe me to be so. You feel that you are not fighting against a man, but against God Himself, and you tremble. You tremble because, Cain, you cannot see God and imagine Him other than as the One who takes vengeance upon Himself and avenges the innocent. You are afraid that what happened to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram and their followers will happen to you. And yet, knowing who I am, you fight against Me. I should say to you, "Cursed be you!" But then I would no longer be the Savior... Feb. 15, 1947. T8ch8 T9ch567.

This is the passage from the Bible to which Jesus refers: Numbers 16. (1) Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi, gathered a following, including Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab, and Hon, the son of Peleth, who were sons of Reuben. 2 They rose up against Moses, with two hundred and fifty men with them , who were of the , children of Israel, , princes , of , the assembly.

called together the elders and the people. [3]They gathered around Moses and Aaron and said, "You do not need to bear the guilt of the Lord, for we know that we have sinned. We have sinned, and we will bear the guilt. (4)When Moses heard this, he fell on his face. (5) [He]spoke to Korah and all his company, saying, "Tomorrow the Lord will make known who is his and who is holy, and he will bring him near to him, the one whom he has chosen, he will bring near to him. (6) Do this: Take censers, Korah and all his company. (7) Tomorrow, put fire in them and put incense on it before the Lord, and the one whom the Lord chooses is the one who is holy. That is enough, sons of Levi." (8) Moses said to Korah, "Listen, sons of Levi. (9)Is it too little for you that the God of Israel has separated you from the assembly of Israel to bring you near to himself, to do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord and to stand before the assembly to do his service? (10) [He]has brought you near to himself, you and all your brothers, the sons of Levi, with you, and yet you seek the priesthood. (11) That is why you and all your followers gather against the Lord. And who is Aaron that you murmur against him?" (12) Moses sent for Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab, and they said, "We will not come up. (13) Is it not enough that you have brought us out of a land flowing with milk and honey to kill us in the wilderness, that you also set yourself as a prince over us? (14) You have not brought us into a land flowing with milk and honey, nor given us fields and vineyards for our possession. Do you think you can blind the eyes of these people? We will not go up." (15)Moses was very angry and said to the Lord, "Do not accept their offering. I have not taken a donkey from them, nor have I harmed any of them." (16) Moses said to Korah, "You and all your followers are to appear before the Lord tomorrow, you and they, along with Aaron. (17) Each of you is to take his censer, put incense in it, and present your censers before the Lord. Two hundred and fifty censers will be there, along with yours and Aaron's.

Each of you take your censer. 18 They took their censers, put fire in them, and threw in incense, and they stood at the entrance of the tent of meeting, with Moses and Aaron. 19 Korah had gathered the whole assembly against Moses and Aaron at the entrance of the tent of meeting. Then the glory of the Lord appeared to the entire assembly. (20) And the Lord spoke to Moses and Aaron, saying, (21) "Separate yourselves from among this assembly, and I will destroy them in a moment." (22) And they fell on their faces and said, "O God, God of the spirits of all flesh, one man has sinned, and will you be angry with the whole assembly?" (23) The Lord spoke to Moses, saying, (24) "Speak to the assembly and say, 'Move away from the tabernacle of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.'" (25) Moses rose and went to Dathan and Abiram, and the elders of Israel followed him. (26) He spoke to the assembly, saying, "Move away from the tents of these wicked men, and do not touch anything that belongs to them, lest you be consumed in all their sins." (27) They moved away from the tents of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. Then Dathan and Abiram came out and stood at the entrance of their tents, with their wives, their sons, and their little children. (28) Moses said,
"By this you will know that the Lord has sent me to do all these things, and that I do not act on my own: 29 If these people die as all men die, and if their fate is the same as that of all men, then it is not the Lord who has sent me, (30) but if the Lord does something unprecedented, if the earth opens its mouth and swallows them up, them and all that belongs to them, and they go down alive into the grave, then you will know that these men have despised the Lord." (31) As he finished saying all these words, the ground beneath them split apart. (32) The earth opened its mouth and swallowed them up, them and their families, with all the people of Korah and all their possessions. (33) They went down alive into the grave, them and all that belonged to them, and the earth covered them, and they disappeared from among the assembly. (34) All Israel who were around them fled at

their cry, for they said, "Let us flee, lest the earth swallow us up."
35 Fire came forth from the presence of the Lord and consumed the 250 men who were offering the incense.

Theological Error No. 184: Jesus lies to a child about Judas.

490.6 (…) [the child] "You don't have that bad man with you anymore?" "What bad man? There are no bad men with me..." said Jesus, smiling at him. "Yes, there is! That tall, dark man who was laughing... you know, the one I told you was beautiful on the outside but ugly on the inside... he's evil." (...) "Of course he's with me, that man. He's one of my apostles. But now he's very good... Why are you shaking your head? We mustn't think badly of our neighbors, especially those we don't know." The child lowered his head and remained silent. "You're not answering me?" [The child]: "You don't want me to tell lies... and I promised you I wouldn't, which I did. But if I tell you now that yes, I believe he is good, I am saying something that is not true, because I think he is bad. I can keep my mouth shut to please you, but I cannot keep my mind shut to stop thinking." The outburst is so impetuous and so logical in its childish simplicity that everyone who hears it bursts out laughing. Everyone except Jesus, who sighs and says, "Well, there's one thing you must do: pray that he becomes good, if you really think he's bad (...) Sept. 10, 1946. T7ch185. T7ch490.

It is materially a lie to tell a child that
"Now" Judas "is very good," even though Jesus knows perfectly well, according to "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," that Judas is full of all kinds of vices and that nothing has happened in Judas' recent life to suggest that he is
"very good" "now." Jesus reproaches him for saying that

Judas is bad when the child does not know him, but the child has already spoken with Judas, according to the vision of June 10, 1945, chapter 184.7, and Judas offered him money to say publicly that he is good: "*I am young and handsome. Why don't you examine me?" "Because I don't like you. Mum says that when you don't like something, you don't touch it (...) If you tell me I'm good, I'll give you this coin." "What am I going to do with it? What can you buy with a lie?*

In the rest of the conversation, when Judas' attempt at bribery fails, he insults the child by calling him
"crazy." It is therefore incorrect to say that the child does not know Judas. The child then explains to Jesus that it would be a lie to say that Judas is good; we are therefore faced with a child who is lecturing Jesus because this child is right and Jesus has no reason to lie to him by saying that Judas is "very good now."

Jesus' lie is a sin (so since Jesus is perfect and has never sinned, this view is false and disrespectful to Jesus). Inviting the child to pray for Judas is a pitiful diversion because that is not the point. The child says that Judas is evil, Jesus says that Judas is very good now. It is absurd to ask him to pray for Judas when he is supposedly very good. Jesus seems to admit his own lie by giving up on convincing him of Judas's supposed goodness ("very good"). In "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," Judas is such a caricature that even a child is shocked that Jesus counts him among his apostles. "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" does nothing to help us understand the mystery of Judas; on the contrary. There was a way for Jesus to avoid this problem without having to lie to a child.

Theological Error #185: Eve lived to satisfy her lust and debauchery.

Note: In 1944, 90% of humans lived to satisfy their lust.

*17.19 (...) [Eve] rolled in the mud and filth (...) 17.21(…) at present [*in 1944!!!], *nine-tenths of you are like Eve (…) : you live, not to love one another, but to satisfy your lust, not for Heaven, but for debauchery. You are no longer creatures endowed with a soul and reason, but soulless and mindless dogs. You have killed your soul and corrupted your reason. Truly, I tell you that wild beasts surpass you in the honesty of their love.* March *8*, 1944. T1 ch26. T1ch17.16.

Neither Holy Scripture, nor the Fathers, nor the Magisterium teach that Eve was particularly guilty of lust. This accusation is undoubtedly linked to the fact that, according to Valtorta, the original sin was the conjugal act between Adam and Eve.

Theological Error No. 186: Contraception is prostitution

Theological Error No. 187: Jesus does not help Catholics understand and accept the condemnation of contraception.

Theological Error No. 188: Jesus speaks ambiguously about pleasure without giving his criteria for morality.

123.3 (...) Marriage means procreation, and the act signifies and must be fertilization. Without this, it is immorality. The marriage bed must not be turned into a brothel, and it becomes such if it is defiled by passion and not consecrated by motherhood (...) To refuse to marry and viciously lose one's strength is a fault. It is prostitution committed on the marriage bed (...) O women who are willingly barren (...) you may be like prostitutes and commit impurity even while being with your own husband, because it is not motherhood but pleasure that you seek, and all too often (...) Vision, March 4, 1945. T2ch90. T2ch123.

As in August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5., the doctrine on the morality of sexual unions between spouses is not given. In Catholic morality, it is not enough that the "marital bed" be "consecrated by motherhood" for all sexual acts between spouses to be morally good. Valtorta's Jesus should know that in the 1970s the sexual revolution would shake the world and that it would be very urgent to help Catholics know and understand Catholic sexual morality.

Nothing is said about the perfect morality of unions between people who are too old to have children. Nothing is said

to help Catholics accept the encyclical *Humanae Vitae,* which reiterated the traditional position condemning contraception. On the subject of contraception, to say that an act of contraception is prostitution is not Catholic teaching. These are delicate and difficult subjects, and we must not mix everything up and say anything, because prostitution and the use of contraception are not similar or comparable sins.

The expression "it is not motherhood but pleasure that you seek, and all too often" is problematic because pleasure is neutral in itself, that is, it is morally good when it is the fruit of a morally good act and morally bad when it is the effect of a morally bad act.

Frequency does not change the nature of the pleasure experienced by spouses if their union is motivated by one of the three holy intentions that must govern their intimate and sexual life:

No. 1: to procreate a child

No. 2: to strengthen their bonds of love, to fulfill the mutual gift of their bodies, to recreate and give joy and pleasure to their spouse for the well-being of their physical and spiritual life. For a life of tenderness and mutual physical benefits stimulates gratitude and joy in life.

No. 3: The remedy for lust: Marital unions can be a means of avoiding acts of lust such as masturbation, adultery, etc. An act is morally good or bad according to three criteria: the nature of the act itself (because some acts are intrinsically evil), the circumstances of the act, and the intention. Therefore, this phrase in which Jesus reproaches people for seeking pleasure too often is theologically problematic.

The indecency of an apparition or vision proves that it does not come from God

Abbot Adolphe Tanquerey explains in his *Précis d'Ascétique et de Mystique* (No. 1502 b) that any vision must be rejected as false if it is contrary to the laws of morality or decency.

However, Maria Valtorta claims to have had a vision of young people completely naked following their miraculous healing from leprosy: the young girl nicknamed *the Beauty of Chorozaïn* (ch. 94.5) and a young man (see indecencies Nos. 152-153). The issue of indecency in La Belle Eau (*the Beauty of Chorozaïn)* was also raised by Father Alberto Vaccari in his expert report for the Holy Office.

There are other ways of making a mystic understand that a leper has regained perfectly healthy skin than offering her the spectacle of seeing that person completely naked.

Other more serious problems of indecency exist in "The Gospel as Revealed to Me": the kisses on the mouth that Jesus is said to have given to:

three men, two
babies
and a boy under the age of 15.

The height of indecency is reached with a kiss on the mouth of the Virgin Mary by Jesus when he appears to her after his resurrection.

We omit the cases where he blew into the mouth of a baby (EMV 368.7) and a cancer patient (EMV 38) because these were not kisses on the lips.

Theological Error No. 189 and Indecency No. 141: Jesus kisses St. James on the mouth.

258.9 "Don't cry anymore (...) Come, I kiss you like this to help you forget the burden of my destiny as a man. You will

will remember it when the time comes, as you asked. Here, I kiss you on your mouth, which must repeat my words to the people of Israel, and on your heart, which must love as I have said, and here, on your temple, where life will cease at the same time as the last word of loving faith in Me (...) August 20, 1945. T4ch121. T4ch258. Italian: *Come, I kiss you like this, to help you forget the horror of my fate as a man. You will find the memory in due time, as you have asked. Here, I kiss you on the mouth that must repeat my words to the people of Israel (...)*

This passage is both an error regarding Jewish customs and an insult to Jesus and Saint James. In general, the Valtortists to whom I mention this respond:
"Yes, but he didn't put his tongue in, it's not sexual." But our point is simply that this gesture violates Jewish decency and morality. Why is it so difficult for Valtortists to believe that Jesus never kissed any man on the mouth? This act was forbidden by the rules of Jewish modesty and chastity.

To say that this passage constitutes indecency against Jesus does not mean that we are inciting hatred or violence towards homosexual persons. Our intention is not to be homophobic. The Catechism of the Catholic Church asks us to avoid "any form of unjust discrimination" towards homosexual persons (cf. No. 2358). We respect homosexual and bisexual persons, while expressing our personal commitment to the Catholic faith and morality. It is simply a matter of expressing that, within the framework of Jewish morality, as within the framework of Catholic morality, to write that Jesus kissed another man on the mouth is a way of insulting him and disrespecting him, because it violates the Jewish morality to which Jesus is supposed to conform.

Catholics profess the absolute perfection of Jesus,

his impeccability. Throughout his life on earth, he pushed the limits of perfection, virtue, and holiness to the extreme. Jesus is the supreme model for all humanity. In Russia, men kiss each other on the mouth, but Jerusalem and Palestine are not in Russia, and Jesus and the apostles were not Russian; they did not follow Russian customs. What happens in Russia cannot be used to justify what Maria Valtorta writes. Kissing someone on the mouth by surprise is considered a criminal offense and is punishable by French courts. The penalty can be up to five years in prison and a fine of 70,000€ s (Article 222-22 of the Penal Code).

In the scene described by Maria Valtorta, St. James is kissed by surprise; Jesus does not warn him, nor does he ask his permission. The mouth is an intimate area; it is a secondary erogenous zone. Kissing on the cheek is something else entirely, because the cheek is not a secondary erogenous zone; that is, a part of the body that is not related to reproduction but can cause sexual arousal or pleasure when stimulated. In Jewish culture, the mouth and lips are connected to the intimate sphere and sensuality.

Theological Error No. 190 and Indecency No. 142: Jesus kisses Judas on the mouth.

406.6 (...) "You give me a kiss, Master?" "Yes, Judas, and I will give you more..." Jesus sighed deeply, with pain. But he kisses Judas on the cheek. Then he takes his head in his hands, holding it close to his face, a few inches away, and stares at it, studying it, piercing it with his magnetic gaze. And Judas, the unfortunate man, does not flinch. He remains apparently unperturbed under this examination. He only turns a little pale and for a

moment he closes his eyes. And Jesus kisses his lowered eyelids, then his mouth, then his heart, lowering his head to find the disciple's heart... and he says: "Here: to chase away the clouds, to make you feel the gentleness of Jesus, to strengthen your heart." Sept. 20, 1944. T6ch95. T6ch406.

In this scene, Jesus takes advantage of the fact that Judas has his eyes closed to kiss him on the mouth. Judas had only asked for and received a kiss on the cheek. Judas' request for a kiss on the cheek contradicts the Valtortists' minimizing explanations, because if their so-called harmless kiss on the lips had been true, Judas would have asked for it. This act is considered assault in France. It is punishable by law. Jesus never did such a thing. See what we wrote above about the kiss on St. James.

Theological Error No. 191 and Indecency No. 143: Jesus kisses Abel on the mouth.

475.6 (…) Jesus makes a gesture that he never makes in public. He bends down because he is much taller than Abel and, taking Abel's head in his hands, he kisses him on the mouth, saying, "Let it be so," at least I believe that is what his "Marana Tha" means. And he adds: "For your feelings, let it be done according to your words (...) August 17, 1946. T7ch170. T7ch475.

See what we wrote above about Jesus' kisses on St. James and Judas. Once again, Jesus neither warned Abel nor asked his permission to kiss him.

Theological Error No. 192 and Indecency No. 144: St. Peter silences Jesus by kissing him on the mouth.

545.6 (...) poor Simon, who absolutely refuses to believe that nothing bad can happen to me until the moment decreed by God, and that then... nothing will be able to defend me from Evil..." Peter clings to his neck and closes his mouth with a kiss, saying: "Be quiet! Be quiet! Don't say these things to me! I don't want to hear them!" Jesus manages to free himself enough to speak and whispers: "You don't want to hear them, and that is a mistake! But I forgive you... Monday, April 22, 1946. T8ch5. T8ch545.

It is profoundly erroneous to imagine that in Palestine 2,000 years ago, men interrupted each other by kissing each other on the mouth. To assert such a thing constitutes a misunderstanding of Jewish customs. In Maria Valtorta's vision, Jesus shows no reproach, no displeasure at this gesture, which is indecent and unthinkable. We refer to what we have written above about other kisses on the mouth and reiterate our clear intention to respect homosexual persons as Catholic morality requires. Our purpose is to analyze the writings of a mystic within the framework of Jewish and Christian morality.

The kiss on Maria Valtorta's mouth brings to mind the Gnostics and **the apocryphal Gospel according to Philip**: "25. If the word came out of the mouth, it would nourish through the mouth and make perfect. For it is by a kiss that the perfect beget and give birth. For this reason we also kiss one another, and we are made fruitful by one another's grace."
"44. Sophia, who is called barren, is the mother of angels. And the companion of the Son is Mary Magdalene. The Lord loved her more than all the disciples, and he often kissed her

on the mouth."

Theological Error No. 193 and Indecency No. 145: Jesus kisses a baby on the mouth for the first time.

64.6 (...) Jesus takes the dying infant and holds him to his heart. He keeps him there for a moment, with his little waxen face, his lips purple, his eyelids already closed. He holds him like this for a moment... and when he detaches him from his blond beard, the little face is pink, the little mouth sketches a childish smile (...) His hands (...) play in the hair and beard of Jesus, who laughs. November *9*, 1944. T2ch27. T1ch64.

Christian morality, inspired by the life of Jesus, emphasizes purity and respect for people, especially the most vulnerable, such as children. The Gospels themselves show Jesus as a figure of protection and paternal love toward children (Matthew 19:14) but without any ambiguity in his behavior. However, the passages where Jesus kisses on the mouth contradict the traditional image of Christ as conveyed by the canonical Gospels. These descriptions offend the sensibilities of believers because they suggest behaviors that, in the modern context, are criminally punishable. Kissing a baby on the mouth is indecent; it was not a practice among Jews.

This is a significant sociological error. Jews did not tolerate strangers kissing babies on the mouth. It is deeply disrespectful to Jesus to write that he could have committed such an act of indecency and immorality on a baby. This view is all the more serious in our time, when the Church is facing

the revelation of numerous sexual crimes committed by priests, with the complicity of too many bishops, against children and adolescents.

If a priest claimed to be imitating Maria Valtorta's Jesus in order to kiss a child or a baby on the mouth, he should be immediately reduced to the lay state and forbidden from any contact with young people, because such an act demonstrates a lack of common sense, a complete lack of discernment, if not pedocriminal perversion. Maria Valtorta's Jesus sets an example that violates French law, which prohibits any sexual assault against minors under the age of 15. A kiss on the mouth by a stranger can be considered sexual assault, which is punishable under French criminal law by seven years in prison and a fine of €150,000 (Articles 222-22 and 222-29 of the Penal Code).

The second error in the description of this miracle is its laborious and time-consuming nature, whereas most miracles in the Gospel are instantaneous and very simple. Jesus is true God and true man; he only has to make an act of will for the miracle to happen. When he makes mud on the blind man's eyes, the Church Fathers explain that this is because the blind man had very weak faith and that this stratagem of the mud facilitated his faith in Jesus' ability to heal him.

Nothing justifies all the steps of the miracle described by Valtorta: No. 1, take the child in his arms; No. 2, press him to his heart; No. 3, "he keeps him for a moment against his mouth" and "for a moment, he keeps him like that." False prophets need long prayers and spectacular gestures to perform their healings; the miracles of Jesus in the Gospels stand out for their simplicity and suddenness, their divine clarity. Through them, divine power bursts forth in a sublime manner. The real Jesus does not have to wait "a moment" to raise a baby from the dead.

Theological Error No. 194 and Indecency No. 146: Jesus He kisses a second baby on the mouth.

345.5 – "Jesus takes the bundle of half-cold flesh and cloth, holds the little one upright by the armpits, and presses his mouth to the half-open lips, leaning forward because the little head hangs back. He blows hard into the lifeless throat... He remains for a moment with his lips pressed against the little mouth, then moves away... and a chirping sound trembles in the still air... a second, louder... a third... and finally a real cry as he tries to move his little head, waving his hands and feet, while in a long triumphant cry of a newborn, his little hairless head and tiny face take on color... and his mother's cry answers him."
November 29, 1945. T5ch33. T5ch345.

Same answer as for the first baby kissed on the mouth in chapter 64.6: such an act contradicts both Jewish and Christian morality and violates French law, which prohibits any sexual assault against minors under the age of 15. A kiss on the mouth by a stranger can be considered sexual assault, which is punishable by seven years in prison and a €150,000 fine under the Penal Code.

Furthermore, in this case, Jesus has to try three times, which does not correspond to the instantaneous and truly divine miracles of the Gospels. The miracle takes so long to achieve that one might even wonder if Jesus is not simply performing mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to revive the baby. This demeans Jesus and ridicules him.

Theological Error No. 195 and Indecency No. 147: Jesus kisses a child under the age of 15 on the mouth to perform a miracle.

516.2 - It is a beautiful miracle that of a mute child whom his mother presents to Him weeping, and whom Jesus heals with a kiss on the mouth, and who uses the words given to him by the Word to cry out the two most beautiful names: "Jesus! Mama!" October 22, 1946. T7ch213. T8ch516.

The case is that of a child under the age of 15, otherwise Valtorta would have referred to a teenager.
This gesture violates Jewish and Christian morality, and it violates French law, which prohibits any sexual assault against minors under the age of 15. A kiss on the mouth by a stranger can be considered sexual assault, which is punishable under French criminal law by 7 years in prison and a fine of €150,000 (Articles 222-22 and 222-29 of the Penal Code). This would set a very bad example for pedophiles and for everyone else. Jesus never kissed anyone on the mouth, let alone children or teenagers.

Note: Does "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" encourage us to see kisses on the mouth throughout the Bible?

Maria Valtorta seems to have a disturbing effect on some Valtortists such as Jean-François Lavère. Indeed, on this page https://www.maria-valtorta.org/Publication/TOME%2004/04-121.htm (and probably in his books defending "The Gospel as Revealed to Me") contain the following statements: *"(...) bacio sulla bocca (...) The kiss on the mouth is mentioned several times in the Bible (...) Genesis 27 ([26]); Genesis 48 ([10]); 1 Samuel 20 ([41])allow us to affirm that this kiss was practiced in ancient Judea*

. It was a symbolic gesture closely linked to the biblical passages where the breath of God (Genesis 1:2) transmits life and animates the creature (...) Saint Paul (Romans 16:16; 1 Corinthians 16:20; 2 Corinthians 13:12; 1 Timothy 5:26) and Saint Peter (1 Peter 5:1) recommended in their letters the kiss of peace between believers, and this practice spread throughout Christianity until the Middle Ages.

Saint Bernard (...) commenting (...) "Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth," declared "Happy kiss, and admirable for its wonderful complacency, where it is not one mouth that rests on another, but God who unites himself with man (...) Saint Bernard interprets this kiss as the kiss of peace given by God to humanity (...) the highest mystical experience, "a kiss of supreme complacency and intoxicating sweetness" (...) which consists in being "one spirit with God (...) in ancient Greece, kissing on the mouth was used to express a concept of equality between people of the same rank.

This gesture was then a sign of friendly affection, exactly like the one Peter spontaneously made when he kissed Jesus on the lips ("The Gospel as Revealed to Me" 545.6).

Kissing on the lips was also common among knights: it was a sign of recognition and mutual support (...) sealed the oath of allegiance (...) and had no sexual connotation.

You can find the full text by J.-F. Lavère at the URL indicated; we are only providing short quotations in accordance with French law in this area.

The kiss of peace recommended by St. Paul never consisted of a kiss on the lips. The biblical characters

in the references given never kissed each other on the mouth.

To make St. Bernard a defender of real, physical kisses on the mouth between Christians on the pretext that these kisses have a symbolic value seems to us entirely false and a shameful manipulation of the magnificent writings of St. Bernard.

Genesis 27 [26] Then Isaac, his father, said to him, "Come near and kiss me, my son." Genesis 48 [10] For Israel's eyes were dim with age, so that he could not see well. Joseph brought them near to him, and Israel embraced them and kissed them.

1 Samuel 20: [41] As soon as the boy had gone, David rose from the south side and fell on his face to the ground and bowed himself three times before Jonathan. Then they kissed each other and wept together until David wept. (4) (2) And Jonathan said to David, "Go in peace, now that we have sworn by the Lord, saying, 'The Lord is between me and you, and between my descendants and your descendants forever.'"

Theological Error No. 196: Satan retains a remnant of love for Jesus, whom he contemplated in Heaven.

46.5 (...) I teach you because there was a day when I looked at you with angelic joy, and a remnant of that love remained in me (...) February 24, 1944. T2ch5. T1ch46.

This is an error because there is not a single atom of love for God in Satan. Read *the Supplement* to *the Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas, the questions where he speaks of demons.

http://jesusmarie.com/thomas_d_aquin_somme_theologique.html

Theological Error #197: Satan tells Jesus that he knows he is God, but a minute earlier he tells him that God is far away from him. Another error: Satan says that he knows men better than God, their omniscient creator.

46.4 (...) I have been watching you for so long. Ever since you were baptized. You call on the Eternal One? He is far away. Now you are on earth and among men. And among men, I am king (...) Come, let's go. They do not deserve to suffer for them. I know them better than you." (...) February 24, 1944. T2ch5. T1ch46.

There are many other errors in Valtorta's account of Jesus' temptation in the desert, and we have pointed out some of them. We invite readers to read the comments on this episode by St. Thomas Aquinas on the Internet, in his Commentary on St. Matthew and the *Golden Chain* Commentaries on St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke. They will see how much "The Gospel as it was revealed to me" hinders a proper understanding of these verses.

Theological Error No. 198: The Evangelists concealed Satan's first temptation of Jesus in the desert: to incite him to marry.

Theological Error No. 199: Inviting Jesus, exhausted from 40 days without food or drink, to marry, then realizing within a minute that this is foolishness.

46.5 (...) woman. She is like a lark. She needs something to sparkle and attract her. Gold and domination are the two sides of the mirror that attract women (...) Go to women if you want to know what life is, and only then will you know how to heal and cure the ills of humanity (...) She

is beautiful, you know, woman! (...) 46.6 - But, what a fool I am! You are hungry and I am talking to you about women. Your strength is exhausted (...) Feb. 24, 1944. T2ch5. T1ch46, 1985 edition.

There is no sin in getting married. Marriage is not a sin, even for Jesus. Jesus could very well have gotten married. Then, faced with a man, Jesus, whom he had watched closely since birth, never committing the slightest sin and having perfect control over his passions, it is utterly stupid to suggest to him that he should satisfy the desires of the flesh. Note the stupidity of this distortion of the Gospel: talking about women to a man who has not eaten or drunk anything for 40 days. "The Gospel as it was revealed to me" makes Satan look like a poor tempter who is only good at making sexist remarks about women.

Scientific Error No. 3: The imprint on the Shroud was fixed by uremic toxins.

613.7 (...) you who can no longer stand or walk without the support of science! — know that the cruel bruises on my kidneys were the most powerful chemical agent in the miracle of the Holy Shroud. My kidneys, almost broken by the lashes, could no longer function (...) they became unable to filter, so that urea accumulated and spread into my blood (...) This caused me to suffer from uremic poisoning and led to the appearance of a reagent which, sweating from my corpse, fixed my imprint on the fabric (...) the uremic toxins, abundant enough to produce an indelible imprint. Dictated February 20, 1944. Absent from Anc., T10ch613.

The idea that the image on the Shroud of Turin was formed by a toxin derived from urea is a mistake. It

is not supported by anyone. The image on the Shroud is the result of very superficial discoloration of the linen fibers. This discoloration affects only the outermost layer of the fibrils, to a depth of approximately 200 to 600 nanometers. It is oxidation and dehydration of the cellulose, limited to the surface of the fibers, without penetrating deeper. People could say anything they wanted about the Shroud in 1944, but not anymore.

Scientific Error No. 4: St. Joseph refers to the Haggadah, which did not exist at the time of Jesus.

40.2 - *Joseph presents Jesus (...) I beg you to examine him with kindness and justice (...) He knows the precepts, traditions, decisions, and customs of the scrolls and phylacteries (...) He can therefore, knowing the Law itself and its three branches of Halakha, Midrash, and Haggadah, conduct himself as a man (...)* Vision of Thursday, Dec. 21, 1944. T1ch67. T1ch40.

Historically, the Haggadah dates from between the 2nd and 5th centuries AD, so it is impossible for Saint Joseph to have expressed himself in this way. The Haggadah consists of narrative or legendary parts of rabbinical literature, as opposed to parts concerning the Law.

Scientific Error #5: Ridiculing Jesus by making him use psychoanalytic language: Jesus speaks of the forces of the "ego."

17.1 (...) to possess God. To possess him by deserving him through that absolute mastery which keeps all the forces of the "ego" subject to it, so that they serve this one goal: to deserve to possess God.
March 5, 1944. T1ch24. T1ch17.

Scientific Error No. 6: Women are better at shopping than men.

196.1 (...) Jesus said to Saint Peter: *"Women... they are better at shopping than we are."* June 21, 1945. T3ch57. T3ch196. This sexist generalization is stupid; it ridicules Jesus and Christianity.

Scientific Error No. 7: Jesus said that the brain is the seat of intelligence, whereas at the time everyone thought that the heart was the seat of intelligence.

126.2 (...) Man, on the contrary, because he has not only a tongue and a voice, but a complex set of nerves whose center is in the brain, the seat of intelligence, is able to grasp new sensations, make them the object of his reflections, and give them names.
Saturday, March 10, 1945. T2ch93. T2ch126.

If Jesus had really spoken like this, his listeners would have taken him for a madman. The Bible itself speaks of the heart as the seat of man's decisions.

Scientific Error No. 8: The nail in the left arm was not driven into the palm as Valtorta claims, but into the wrist, as in the right hand.

The Shroud of Turin proves that Valtorta's vision was incorrect. Dr. Barbet's work provides further evidence that this vision was false.

Scientific Error No. 9: The suffering is greater in the wrist than in the palm, contrary to what Valtorta says, because the nerve is severed by the nail in the wrist and not by a nail in the palm.

609.5 The right hand is nailed. They move on to the left (...) they take a rope, tie the left wrist and pull until the joint is dislocated and the tendons and muscles are torn (...) Now they can barely reach the beginning of the metacarpal bone, near the wrist. They resign themselves and nail where they can, that is, between the thumb and the other fingers, exactly in the center of the metacarpal bone. There the nail enters more easily, but with greater suffering because it has to cut important nerves, so that the fingers remain inert while those of the right hand have contractions and tremors that indicate their vitality. Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

The two thumbs are invisible on the hands of the Holy Shroud, which also proves that the two nails were driven into the wrists in each case. The diocese of Salamanca in Spain exhibited a life-size sculpture of Jesus based on the Holy Shroud, and it can be clearly seen that the nail hole is in the left wrist.

Scientific Error No. 10: Repeating the error of placing the nail and the wound of the left hand in the metacarpal bone and not in the wrists (VS the Shroud of Turin and the book by Dr. Pierre Barbet).

632.6 (...) Jesus does not give him his hands to kiss, those hands on which the wide sleeve of his white garment falls down to the middle of the metacarpal, hiding the wounds, but he takes his head in his hands (...) Visions April 16 and 17, 1947. T10ch18. T10ch632.

Scientific Error No. 11: Valtorta's visions of Jesus' agony on the cross and the details of his physical suffering are contradicted by science.

609.17 (...) *Christ's face alternates between intense redness and the greenish pallor of someone dying from hemorrhage (...) The spine (...) curves forward more and more (...)* the light is now the color of dark ash (...) Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

To learn how Jesus really suffered, we invite you to read *The Passion of Jesus Christ According to the Surgeon*, by Dr. Pierre Barbet (published by MédiasPaul, available second-hand or in libraries as it appears to be out of print as of April 2025).

We also invite you to watch the video by Dr. Philippe Boxho, a Belgian forensic scientist, on the Passion of Jesus, entitled "This forensic scientist performed an autopsy on Christ based on the Shroud of Turin," https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=voG4Z677BEk

Scientific Error No. 12: The Temple of Jerusalem has domes covered with gold

8.4 (...) Here they are inside the walls of the Temple (...) Here they are at the foot of a vast marble cube crowned with gold. Each convex dome, resembling half of an enormous orange, glistens in the sun (...) Vision August 30, 1944. T1ch13. T1ch8.

41.1 - *I see Jesus (...) standing in front of a taller, majestic, very rich building with round domes that shine in the sun as if they were covered with metal, copper or gold. The whole thing is surrounded by a wall (...) as if it were a fortress (...) I realize that I am inside the Temple of Jerusalem.* January 28, 1944. T1ch68. T1ch41.

Flavius Josephus left us a detailed description of the Temple of Jerusalem (The Jewish War, Book 5, Chapter 4,
§ 1-6) in which he did not fail to mention the existence of magnificent domes covered with gold. In an attempt to lend credence to the vision of "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," the Valtortists take as a faithful witness Maimonides (1138-1204), who lived more than a thousand years after the destruction of Solomon's Temple. Maimonides cannot therefore serve as a witness to a building he never saw and about which he wrote a thousand years later. In their criticism of Flavius, the Valtortists argue that Flavius Josephus "does not say that there are no golden domes," so according to them, Flavius Josephus should, in his description, mention everything that is not found in the Temple of Jerusalem: no drawbridges, no Egyptian pyramids, no spiral staircases, no lion pits, no Olympic stadiums, etc. The stupidity of such an argument is obvious. When we read the details given by Flavius Josephus, we understand that he would not have failed to mention such golden domes.

Flavius Josephus, The Jewish War, BOOK 5 – CHAPTER 4 – § 1 to 6:
"1. [184] The Temple was, as I have said, built on a high elevation, and at first the plateau on which it stood was hardly sufficient to contain the Stuel and the altar. The slopes all around were steep. But when King Solomon, who built the Temple, surrounded the eastern side of the building with a wall, he built a portico on the embankment
: on all other sides, the Temple remained undefended. In the ages that followed, as the people continually added new embankments, the hill thus leveled became wider. The northern rampart was then demolished, providing the space that was later occupied by the entire Temple enclosure. The hill was surrounded from its foundations by a triple circular rampart. The execution of this great work exceeded all expectations: i t required

long centuries and all the sacred treasures provided by tributes sent to God from various regions of the universe. Thus were built the upper walls and the lower temple. The lowest part of the latter building was raised on terraces to a height of three hundred cubits, or even more in some places. However, the depth of the foundations was not entirely visible because the Jews had filled in the valleys to level the ground of the city streets. Stones forty cubits long were used for these substructures. The abundance of resources and the generosity of the people gave the projects extraordinary grandeur; patience and time helped to realize a hope whose end no one dared even to conceive.

2. [190] The buildings erected above these enormous foundations were worthy of them. All the porticoes had a double row of columns, twenty-five cubits high, hewn from a single piece of very white marble. The paneling that covered these porticoes was made of cedar. The natural richness of the paneling and the art with which it was polished and fitted together offered a marvelous spectacle, but no painting or sculpture added any external ornament. The width of the porticoes was thirty cubits, and their total perimeter, including the Antonia tower, measured six stadia; the entire uncovered area was paved with stones of various colors. Crossing this space in the direction of the second tower of the Temple, one found around oneself a stone balustrade, three cubits high and very elegantly crafted. Small columns stood at equal intervals, some inscribed in Greek characters, others in Latin, prescribing the law of purity and forbidding any stranger to enter the "holy place," for that was the name given to the second enclosure. Fourteen steps led up to it from the first. Square in shape, it was surrounded by a special wall, the outer height of which

reaching forty cubits, was hidden by the staircase. The interior height measured twenty-five cubits, because the staircase was built against higher ground and was not completely visible from the interior, being partly concealed by the hill. After the fourteen steps, the wall was ten cubits away, on completely level ground. Then a new staircase of five steps led to the gates, which were eight in number on the north and south sides, four on each side: there were necessarily two on the east side, because on that side was the place, separated by a wall, which was reserved for women for worship, and it had been necessary to make a second separate gate opposite the first. In the other directions, two doors, one to the south and the other to the north, led to the women's courtyard; indeed, they could not enter through the others, and they were even forbidden, when passing through the one reserved for them, to cross the dividing wall. The place was also open for worship to the women of the region and their co-religionists who came from outside. The western part had no door on that side; the wall was continuous. The porticoes between the doors, inside the wall facing the treasure rooms, were supported by very beautiful and very tall columns: although simple and not double, these porticoes were in no way inferior to the lower porticoes, except in size.

3. [201] Of the ten doors, nine were entirely covered with gold and silver, as were the doorposts and lintels: one of them, outside the Temple, owed its great superiority over those covered with silver and gold to the glory of Corinthian bronze. Each gate had two doors, each thirty cubits high and fifteen wide. After the entrance, these gates widened inward, embracing long vestibules thirty cubits wide on the right and left; similar to towers, their height exceeded forty cubits; each

was supported by two columns, whose circumference measured twelve cubits. The dimensions of the other gates were the same. But the one that opened beyond the Corinthian gate, toward the east, on the side of the women's hall, and opposite the gate of the Temple, was larger; it was fifty cubits high; its doors reached forty cubits, and its ornamentation was more magnificent, because of the thickness of the silver and gold that were lavishly used. It was Alexander, father of Tiberius, who had adorned the other nine gates. Fifteen steps led from the women's wall to the great gate; they were lower than the five steps that led to the other gates.

4. [207] The Temple, this sacred building, was located in the center: it was accessed by twelve steps. The height and width of its facade were also one hundred cubits; it narrowed toward the back and was only sixty cubits wide, because at the front there were side wings twenty cubits long on either side. Its first gate was seventy cubits high, twenty-five wide, and had no doors, for it represented the sky, immense and boundless. The metopes were all gilded: [metope: square interval, often sculpted, which, in a Doric frieze, separates two triglyphs] through these openings, the first part of the nave appeared completely from the outside in all its majesty, and the sides of the inner door were sparkling with gold in the eyes of the spectators. As the Temple had a double roof [the first part of the nave alone opened at a great height, measuring ninety cubits in height, fifty in length, and twenty in width. The portal of this nave was entirely, as I have already said, overlaid with gold; the same was true of the entire surrounding wall: the vine branches that covered the surface of the door were also of gold, and clusters the size of a man hung from them. As the Temple had a double roof, the interior perspective was

lower than the exterior; there the golden doors were fifty-five cubits high and sixteen wide. In front of them was a veil of equal length, a Babylonian peplos, embroidered with violet wool, linen, scarlet, and purple; this admirable work offered, in its material, a skilful mixture and a kind of image of the universe; for it seemed to symbolize fire by the scarlet, earth by the linen, air by the violet, and the sea by the purple. For two of these materials, it was the color that made the resemblance; for linen and purple, it was their origin, since one is provided by the earth and the other by the sea. The entire spectacle of the heavens was embroidered on the peplos, except for the signs of the zodiac.

5. [215] When one entered, it was the lower part of the Temple that greeted the visitor. It was sixty cubits high, of equal length, and twenty cubits wide. These sixty cubits were in turn divided: the first section, extending forty cubits, contained three works of art that were admired and famous throughout the world: the candlestick, the table, and the incense burner. The seven lamps of the candlestick represented the planets, for that was the number of the branches of the candelabra; the twelve loaves on the altar represented the circle of the zodiac and the year. The incense burner, with the thirteen perfumes with which it was filled, which came from the sea and the inhabited and uninhabited regions of the earth, indicated that everything belongs to God and exists for God.

The rearmost part of the enclosure measured twenty cubits; a veil also separated it from the outside. No object was found there; it was inaccessible, intangible, and invisible to all; it was called the "Holy of Holies."

On the sides of the lower Temple were many dwellings on three floors, communicating with each other; on either side of the special entrances, they led from the gate. The upper Temple, narrower, had no dwellings; it rose forty cubits high

roof, which was simpler in style than the lower temple. Adding this number to the sixty cubits of the lower temple, we obtain a total height of one hundred cubits.

6. [222] The exterior façade lacked nothing that could strike the mind or the eye. Covered everywhere with solid gold plates, the Temple shone in the first rays of the day with such a vivid brilliance that spectators had to turn their eyes away as if from the rays of the sun. To foreigners arriving in Jerusalem, it looked from a distance like a mountain covered with snow, for where it was not gilded, it appeared of the purest whiteness. On its roof stood finely sharpened golden spikes to ward off the filth of birds that might come to rest there. Some of the stones of the building were forty-five cubits long, five high, and six deep.
In front of the Temple stood the altar, which was fifteen cubits high and extended equally in length and width for about fifty cubits; square in shape, it was provided with horn-shaped appendages at the corners. It was accessed from the south by a gently sloping ramp. No iron had been used in the construction of this altar, nor had any iron ever touched it.
The Temple and the altar were surrounded by a balustrade of beautiful, delicately worked stones, about a cubit high, which kept the people at a distance and separated them from the priests.
If the entire city was forbidden to men suffering from gonorrhea and leprosy, the Temple was also forbidden to women during their menstruation; they were not even allowed, when they were pure, to cross the boundaries we have indicated. Men who were not completely purified were forbidden to enter the inner court; the same was true of priests when they were undergoing purification." [end of quote from Flavius Josephus]

Scientific Error No. 13: Mary and Joseph's house is locked with a key, a luxury item at the time.

100.3 "Now, be careful. Mary of Joseph is not at home. She is at her brother-in-law's house, you know? But I have the key. Ask for it so you can enter the house, the workshop, I mean." Wednesday, February 7, 1945. T2ch65. T2ch100.

There were locks in Palestine at that time, but they were quite rare and reserved for important buildings or wealthy owners. Most houses had wooden bolts, which were locked from the inside with a sliding bar.

Scientific Error No. 14: A man from Nazareth uses the word "cousins" when speaking to Jesus.

100.3 (...) a man from Nazareth speaks to Jesus and says to him, *"At this hour, the cousins are at the father's house..."* Wednesday, February 7, 1945. T2ch65. T2ch100.

The term cousin does not exist in Aramaic, the language spoken by the inhabitants of Nazareth, where only the word "brothers." A keyword search of the 5,000 pages of "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" yields 222 uses of the word cousins. This makes 200 errors if we remove the notes that we are not counting.

Scientific Error No. 15: Continual caressing in public is an error concerning the Jewish customs of the time.

100.7 – Let us hurry to comfort our cousins." (...) Jude lowers his arm and weeps, his head on the bench. James is stronger

strong, but his face reflects true inner torment. (...) Jesus caresses them, but they suffer. Jude's cries echo under the stone vault (...) 100.8 (...) John limits himself to kissing and caressing his companions (...) 100.9 – Mary enters and rushes to the two distraught men. She caresses Jude's ebony hair and James's cheek. February 7 , 1945. T2ch65. T2ch100.

Expressions of tenderness were not shown in public, even between husbands and wives. Maria Valtorta had a very unhappy life, with three marriage plans thwarted by her cruel mother. It is understandable that her mediumship appreciates frequent caresses and kisses between all her characters, as well as emphatic references to children suckling at their mothers' breasts (she even goes so far as to refer to "warm breasts"), but none of this is credible in Palestine 2,000 years ago.Even if Maria Valtorta goes to almost comical extremes in her descriptions of frequent caresses and kisses between her characters, "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" helps us understand the importance of human warmth between Jesus and Mary, as well as between Jesus and his apostles. This is something we appreciate in the work. It is undoubtedly one of the things that appeals to its readers. On September 9, 1988, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, the future Pope Benedict XVI, replied to a Canadian woman through his personal secretary, Monsignor Josef Clemens, that Maria Valtorta's work was "a collection of childish fantasies, historical and exegetical errors, all presented in a subtly sensual context."

Scientific Error No. 16: Jesus kisses Judas' mother on the cheeks.

78.2 – Judas goes out with a woman in her fifties (...) "Get up, mother. I have a Mother too, and I will not

allow you to kiss my feet. In the name of my Mother, I give you a kiss, woman. She is your sister... in love and in the painful destiny of the mothers of those who are marked." "What do you mean, Messiah?" asks Judas (...) Jesus does not answer. He is kissing the woman he has helped up and kissing her on the cheeks. Then, holding her by the hand, he goes toward the house. January 14, 1945. T2ch42. T1ch78.

In Palestine 2,000 years ago, men did not kiss women on the cheek in public.

Scientific Error No. 17: Only the *patibulum*, the horizontal bar of the cross, was carried by those condemned to crucifixion. Valtorta sees Jesus carrying a cross like the crucifixes in churches.

Scientific Error No. 18: "a real cross (...) reinforced by (...) bolts."

608.2 (...) *The crosses are brought (...) Jesus' is much longer. I say that the vertical piece is at least four meters long. I see it being brought already formed. I have read about this (...) that (...) the condemned men carried only the two posts on their shoulders. That is possible, but I see a real cross, well-formed, solid, with the arms perfectly embedded in the main piece and well reinforced with nails and bolts.* Vision of Monday, March 26, 1945. T9ch28. T10ch608.
Italian: *Ma io vedo una vera croce, ben contesta, solida, perfettamente incastrata nell'incrocio dei due bracci e ben rinforzata con chiodi e bulloni negli stessi.*

Bolts were invented in the 15th century, so there were none for Jesus' cross.

Scientific Error No. 19: *The cross slips from his hands and falls*

(...) the cross slips from his hands and falls, after striking him hard on the back, forcing him to bend down to pick it up and struggle to put it back on his shoulders. Vision of Monday, March 26, 1945. T9ch28. T10ch608.

Valtorta sees Jesus carrying the cross on his shoulder, she sees it slip from his hands and fall to the ground. This is an error because historical research establishes that the condemned were tied with their arms outstretched to the horizontal bar.

Scientific Error No. 20: Valtorta sees crosses that had to be replanted and fixed in holes dug in the ground each time.

608.15 (...) *Calvary (...) three deep holes have already been prepared, lined with bricks or slates, dug expressly for this purpose. Nearby, there are stones and earth ready to fill in the crosses. Other holes, however, have been left full of stones. It is understood that they are emptied from one time to the next according to the number of those who are serving.* Vision of Monday, March 26, 1945. T9ch28. T10ch608.

Historical and archaeological discoveries contradict this vision. In fact, the Romans did not bother to replant the vertical beams of the crosses after each execution; they were firmly fixed in place once and for all, and the horizontal bar, which had a hole in the middle, was impaled on top of the vertical beam. The wrists of the crucified were nailed to the horizontal beam on the ground, and this crossbar was raised to secure it to the vertical beam (see Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah, Encyclopedia of the Passion of Christ, from*

Gethsemane at the Tomb, 2005, Paris, Bayard, p. 1005 and p. 1040; Maria Grazia Siliato, *Counter-Investigation on the Holy Shroud*, 1998, Paris, Plon/DDB, p. 240.

Scientific Error No. 21: The Romans offered cloths to the crucified to hide their nakedness.

609.2 (...) *The executioners offered the condemned men three rags to tie around their groins, and the thieves took them (...) Jesus (...) held out his hand to beg for the rag from the executioners to hide his nakedness (...) Mary (...) removed the (...) white cloth that veiled her head (...) Longinus presented her with her mother's veil. Jesus recognized it. He wrapped it around himself, wrapping it several times around his pelvis (...)* Vision of March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Jesus was most likely crucified completely naked because nudity was not a problem for the Romans, and it is not credible that they would spare the modesty of Jewish convicts who had deserved the worst of all tortures: death by crucifixion.

Scientific Error No. 22: The executioners sitting on Jesus to nail his hands.

609.4 *(...) Jesus (...) lies down and puts his head where he is told to put it. He opens his arms as he is told to do, stretches out his legs as he is ordered. He only concerned himself with adjusting his veil (...) 609.5 – Two executioners sat on his chest to hold it still (...) A third took his right arm, holding it with one hand at the upper part of the forearm and the other at the fingertips. The fourth (...) places the tip of the nail on the wrist, raises the hammer, and strikes the first blow. Jesus, who had his eyes closed, cries out (...)* Vision of Tuesday

March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

This is a mistake because the arms were already tied with ropes to the horizontal crossbeam (the *Patibulum*), so the condemned men could not prevent their wrists from being nailed. If the intention was to prolong the agony, the ropes tying the arms to the cross were left in place, as this made it easier for the condemned man to breathe and prolonged the excruciating agony through suffocation and generalized muscle tetany. Without the support of the ropes, generalized tetany and asphyxia occurred more quickly. By breaking the shins, the soldiers prevented the condemned man from pushing on his legs to catch his breath, so he died within minutes, unable to breathe.

Scientific Error No. 23: *The cross is dragged near the hole.*

609.7 (...) the cross is dragged close to the hole and bounces on the uneven ground, shaking the poor Crucified One (...) But when the cross is then dropped into its hole (...) it wobbles in all directions, causing the poor suspended Body to move continuously (...) Vision of March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

No, the cross is not dragged to the hole, but the horizontal arm, the Patibulum, is embedded in a recess carved into the vertical beam of the cross: the *stipes* (Latin).

Scientific Error No. 24: "the final convulsions"

608.2 (...) [the cross] designed to support the considerable weight of an adult's body and to hold it up even during the final convulsions (...). Vision of Monday, March 26, 1945. T9ch28. T10ch608.

The Passion according to the surgeon and forensic scientists explains that death by crucifixion is a slow death by suffocation and total muscle tetany, so there are no convulsions as Maria Valtorta saw.

Scientific Error No. 25: *The kidneys and the entire spine curve outward*

609.12 (...) *The crown of thorns prevents him from leaning against the trunk of the cross to help suspend himself by his arms and relieve his feet. The kidneys and the entire spine curve outward, remaining detached from the trunk of the cross from the pelvis upward, due to the force of inertia that causes a suspended body such as his to lean forward.* Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

The crucifix carved by Dr. Charles Villandre reproduces the true position of the human body during the crucifixion: there is no outward curvature of the "loins and the entire spine."

Scientific Error No. 26: the weight of the body falls on the feet

609.20 (...) *The entire weight of the body falls forward onto the feet (...) The head hangs forward so heavily that the neck appears hollowed out in three places: at the throat, completely sunken, and on either side of the sternocleidomastoid muscle (...)* Observation on Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Anatomical details contradicted by *The Passion of Jesus Christ According to the Surgeon*, by Dr. Pierre Barbet.

Scientific Error No. 27: the manner of removing the nails from the crucified

609.32 – *The four executioners also wanted to take care of Jesus to detach him from the cross (...) Joseph (...) told John to imitate him and hold the ladders while they climbed up with levers and pincers.* Vision of Tuesday, March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

In reality, they first removed the nails from Jesus' feet so that they could then remove the horizontal bar, the Patibulum, and lay it on the ground. Once this horizontal beam was on the ground, they were able to remove the nails from the wrists. Valtorta invents actions that contradict what historians and Roman authors teach about the torture of crucifixion.

Scientific Error No. 28: *The arm falls down alongside the body*

Scientific Error No. 29: *The horrible tearing of the left hand*

609.32 (...) *The left palm is unnailed. The arm falls down alongside the body, which now hangs half detached (...) John (...) puts Jesus' arm around his neck (...) and holds it by the fingertips so as not to touch the horrible tear in the left hand, which is almost open. (...)* Vision of March 27, 1945. T9ch29. T10ch609.

Valtorta contradicts the Holy Shroud, which proves that the nails were in the wrists. See the exhibition organized by the Diocese of Salamanca (Spain) with the sculpture of Jesus lying in the tomb, made according to the data of the Holy Shroud. Further proof: on the Holy Shroud, the left hand has no thumb because the perforation in the wrist severs the nerve located there, causing the

retraction of the thumb under the palm, giving the impression that the left hand has no thumb. If the nail had been driven into the palm of the hand as Valtorta writes, the thumb would not have retracted and would be visible on the image of the Shroud.
Another error: due to muscle tetany, the arm did not fall down alongside the body; on the contrary, they probably had to make an effort to pull the arms down towards Jesus' torso because the muscles must have been so contracted and hardened.

Scientific Error No. 30: They buried Jesus' body under a thick layer of ointment.

But this claim is contradicted by the Holy Shroud: there are no traces of thick, sticky ointment.

Scientific Error No. 31: The hands always slipped because of the weight of the dead limbs

On the contrary, the corpse must have been in a state of rigor mortis, due to muscle tetany and extreme cramps caused by death on the cross. See Dr. Pierre Barbet on the movements of a crucified body in *The Passion of Jesus Christ According to the Surgeon*.

Scientific Error No. 32: The shroud is a "large cloth."

610.15 (...) Nicodemus and Joseph [of Arimathea] *(...) anointed the whole body with ointments. They buried him under a layer of ointment (...) anointed everything (...) The mixture of aromatics must have been sticky (...) because I see that the hands remain in place, whereas before they always slipped because of the weight of the dead limbs (...) Finally, the head. After anointing it carefully, so that <u>the features</u>*

disappear under the layer of ointments (...) Jesus. He disappears under the thick cloth of the shroud. He is now nothing more than a shape covered by a cloth. Vision February 19, 1944. T9ch30. T10ch610.

The Holy Shroud of Turin is a linen cloth 0.34 millimeters thick, or 340 microns. It measures 4.4 meters long by 1.1 meters wide. Its fineness and flexibility are remarkable. The measurements were taken during the 1978 examinations by the STURP. It is therefore incorrect to refer to it as a "thick cloth." It is a thin linen cloth. It is about as thick as a light T-shirt, so it is definitely not a "thick cloth."

Scientific Error No. 33: Jesus has very dark blue eyes.

Jesus (...) His eyes were deep, very beautiful, the color I have so often described as very dark sapphire. Notebooks, April 7, 1944

It is highly unlikely that Jesus had blue eyes, as blond-haired, blue-eyed people must have been very rare in Palestine two thousand years ago. If Jesus had been tall and blond (since the Shroud of Turin tells us that Jesus was 5'11", which was tall for the time), Judas would not have needed to indicate Jesus' identity to the Temple guards by kissing him. According to Valtorta, St. John was blond but had only a downy beard, not a full beard; so finding a tall blond man among eleven people would have been easy for the troop that came to arrest Jesus. A tall blond man with blue eyes can be spotted even with a torch, no need to kiss him.

Scientific Error No. 34: St. Peter refers to "chapter 52" of Isaiah, even though chapters did not exist at that time.

324.1 (...) Peter (...) decides to speak. "Today we heard in the synagogue the explanation of chapter 52 of Isaiah. (...) Thursday, November 8, 1945. T5ch12. T5ch324.

Italian: *Ma Pietro (...) si decide a parlare. "Oggi abbiamo sentito nella sinagoga spiegare il capo 52° di Isaia.*

The division into chapters did not exist in ancient times; it was invented around 1226 by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of the University of Paris.

Scientific Error No. 35: The Jews of Palestine pronounce the sacred name of God as "Jehovah."

487.2 (...) "Be silent! Let no one hear you mention Jupiter. It is forbidden here."
"Oh! Between Jupiter and Jehovah, there is little difference. And among gods, one does not take offense... (...) September 4, 1946. T7ch182. T7ch487.

Valtorta claims that the inhabitants of Palestine pronounced the sacred name of God as "Jehovah," whereas scholars unanimously teach that no one at that time pronounced the Tetragrammaton , and , nor , nor , nor , nor , nor vocalization.
"Jehovah."

Scientific Error No. 36 Jesus quibbles over a false subtlety in translation: it should be translated "drink from my cup, drink from my chalice" and not "drink my cup, drink my chalice" because only Jesus could drink the chalice to the dregs.

577.11 (...) In the translations we read: "my cup." I said: "my cup," not "my cup." No man could drink my cup (...) To my disciples (...) it is (...) permitted to drink from this cup from which I have drunk, a drop, a sip (...) But no one will ever drink the whole cup as I have drunk it. It is therefore correct to say "my cup" and not "my cup." Vision of Saturday, March 8, 1947. T8ch38. T9ch577.

However, this difference between "drink from" and "drink my" does not exist in Aramaic, and Jesus' words are contradicted by the Greek manuscripts, because, as Father Guillaume Chevallier says: "The Greek text uses the verb piein + accusative: piein to poterion [πιειν το ποτηριον] (...) nothing in the text justifies a meaning other than a simple direct object." Valtorta's readers believe they are being taught a subtlety of translation when in fact it is stupidity. Valtorta's false Jesus knows neither Aramaic nor the Greek manuscripts of the Gospels, and, to top it all off, he continues in chapter 603.4 to use the expression "drink my cup," which he has just denounced as wrong. Problem pointed out by Father Guillaume Chevallier.

603.4 (...) I ask my privileged ones to drink my cup, so bitter to experience (...)
Dictation from Tuesday, February 15, 1944. T9ch4 and 5. T10ch603.

Scientific Error No. 37: Jesus says that prehistoric skeletons have been found whose "power" amazes scientists because of their size. However, all the skeletons

found measure between 1.06 and 1.70 meters.

I learn that skeletons of ape-men have been found in a cave (...) Jesus: "Look for the key in chapter 6 of Genesis (...) (Genesis 6:1-4) When the sons of God united with the daughters of men and they bore children to them... these were the heroes of old, men of renown." These are the men whose skeletal strength amazes your scientists, who conclude that in the early days, man was much taller and stronger than he is today, and they deduce from the structure of their skulls that man is descended from apes. These are the usual errors of men when faced with the mysteries of creation (...) Dec. 30, 1946, Notebooks from 1945 to 1950.

Scientific Error No. 38: Jesus is blond.

586.6 Mary Magdalene (...) pours thick oil on the head of her Jesus, anointing all his curls (...) Jesus' blond-red head shines like dark gold, very bright after this anointing. The light (...) reflects off Christ's blond head, like a beautiful copper-colored helmet (...) March 28, 1947. T8ch47. T9ch586

Genetically, it is not entirely impossible that Jesus was blond. The probability is even lower that he had blue eyes, but this idea is mainly contradicted by the Gospels, since Judas would not have had to give the sign: "He whom I kiss, him seize" (Matthew 26:48) for his arrest in the Garden of Olives. It would have been enough for them to arrest the tall blond man with blue eyes. Tall because, according to the Holy Shroud, Jesus was 5'10" or 5'11", which made him a tall man for his time.

Scientific Error No. 39: St. Peter wants to eat crab, an impure food forbidden by God.

218.1 (...) John is mesmerized by the sight of the sea (...) Peter (...) lifts his garment and wades through the puddles on the shore in search of some crab or shellfish to suck on. July 14, 1945. T3ch80. T3ch218.

Here is the source of the dietary prohibition: Leviticus 11 [9] *These are the animals you may eat among all those in the waters: Anything in the waters, whether in the seas or in the rivers, that has fins and scales, you may eat. ([10]) But you shall detest all that have not fins and scales in the seas and in the rivers, among all creatures that move in the waters and among all living creatures that are in the waters. ([11]) They shall be an abomination to you; you shall not eat their flesh, and you shall not touch their carcasses. ([12]) All in the waters that have no fins and no scales shall be an abomination to you.*

To try to explain this error, a Valtortist explains that it is a "personal interpretation on the part of Maria Valtorta" of the gestures of Peter that she sees in her vision. Peter is looking for things in the water, and she concludes that he wants to eat something impure, totally forbidden to Jews.

The problem is that if these visions came from God, God who knows everything, would know that there would be grounds for discrediting Maria Valtorta's writings; He would therefore have enlightened Maria Valtorta to prevent her from making such a mistake. Furthermore, Maria Valtorta's Jesus often intervenes to settle the smallest details of the work, doing real editorial work by explaining that a particular quotation from the Gospel should be placed at the very beginning of the work, or that one vision should be inserted before or after another.

However, in the case of the crab or the shellfish forbidden to St. Peter, he does not intervene and allows Maria Valtorta to fall into a gross error. This amounts to accusing St. Peter of violating the law on food prohibitions, and doing so in front of St. John.

Theological Error No. 200: The evangelists are accused of having omitted episodes from the life of Jesus that they did not approve of because of "their unbreakable Hebrew mentality."

Anti-Semitism No. 6: "How many things (...) the evangelists omitted because of their indestructible Jewish mentality regarding episodes they did not approve of!"

Another translation: *652. How many things (...) the Evangelists left out because of their unbreakable Hebrew mentality regarding episodes they did not approve of!* April 28, 1947. T10ch38. T10ch652.

Maria Valtorta accuses the evangelists of loyalty and reliability, which amounts to questioning the power of God the Holy Spirit, who was therefore unable to make them write down what he inspired them to say. The evangelists allegedly blocked the narration of many of Jesus' actions and words because of a Jewish mentality that could not be broken or destroyed, as that is the definition of unbreakable.

It is therefore significant that during discussions with admirers of *the Gospel as it was revealed to me*, they calmly explain that the Gospels lie by omission, while the full truth can be found in the books of Maria Valtorta. This is one of the evil fruits of

"The Gospel as Revealed to Me." See Don Guillaume Chevallier, articles cited.

Anti-Semitism No. 7: Maria Valtorta's anti-Semitism denounced by Sandra Miesel, *American Jewish writer*

https://www.catholicworldreport.com/2021/09/14/a-monument-to-pseudo-religiosity-a-case-against-the-poem- of-the-man-god/ Translated by Father D. Auzenet, 4 words changed.

Sandra Miesel is an American medievalist and writer. She is the author of hundreds of articles and several best-selling books, including *The Da Vinci Hoax: Exposing the Errors in The Da Vinci Code,* which she co-wrote with Carl E. Olson, and is co-editor with Paul E. Kerry of *Light Beyond All Shadow: Religious Experience in Tolkien's Work (*Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2011).

When she refers to specific passages in EMV, such as: (I: p. 432) (V: p. 947) (I: p. 57) (V: pp. 751-52) (V: p. 753) (I: p. 24-25) (I: pp. 283-84) (V: p. 564) (V: p. 620) (I: p. 432) (I: p.282) (IV: p.785) (I: p. 273) (I: p. 263) (V: pp. 762-64) (V: p. 253)(V: 946) (I: p. 7) (IV: p.240) (I: 115) (V: pp. 630-59)(V: p. 640) (V: 670)(V: 947) (V: p. 562) (I: p. 83) (I: p. 665)(I: p.664)(I: p. 30) (I: p.635) (V: p. 623) (IV: p. 804)(V: pp. 557 et seq.). (V: p. 790) (V: p. 652) (V: p. 663) (V: p. 852) (V: p. 642) (V: p. 903) (V: p. 293) (V: p. 566) (V: p. 563) (V: p. 64) (V: p. 831) (V: p. 869), this is the English edition of ***the Gospel as Revealed to Me,*** published in 1986, whose title is ***The Poem of the Man-God,*** distributed in Canada by Éditions Paulines de Sherbrooke, Quebec. Not to be confused with the English edition published in 2014, ***The Gospel as Revealed to Me,*** in ten volumes by the same publisher.

BEGINNING OF THE ARTICLE BY SANDRA MIESEL - Sept. 14, 2021

Why, during all these years, have so few readers of Maria Valtorta's The Poem of the Man-God noticed its glaring and shocking flaws?

This year, Yom Kippur, the Jewish Day of Atonement, begins at sunset on September 15. It is the culmination of the holy days, when God's judgments are sealed upon the unrepentant sinners. It therefore seemed appropriate to honor my father's people by examining a book riddled with crude anti-Semitism, but long admired in certain pious Catholic circles: Maria Valtorta's The Poem of the Man-God.

1. Background

Here is a brief overview for those who do not remember Valtorta's heyday in the 1990s, when the Christian world was gripped by speculation about the end times and many Catholics rallied around the apparition of the month. For its supporters, the Poem is an "impeccable" expansion of the Gospels that has profoundly improved the souls of its readers. But in 1959, it became the penultimate publication to be added to the Vatican's Index of Prohibited Books.

Maria Valtorta was born to Lombard parents on March 14, 1897, in Caserta, Italy. Her father was a non-commissioned officer in the army. Her publisher described her mother as "insensitive,"
"despotic," and extremely strict. Valtorta's mother stifled her education and ended two promising romances.

After taking private vows in 1931, Valtorta aspired to become a "victim soul" and became

permanently bedridden two years later due to a heart condition and an old back injury. Her spiritual director was Father Romuald Migliorini, a member of the Servants of Mary. Valtorta was a tertiary in the same order, which continued to promote her writings and reputation for holiness.

Valtorta is said to have offered God the sacrifice of her intelligence in 1949. She gradually stopped writing as her mental problems increased over the next decade. By the time of her death in 1961, she had reached what Father Benedict Groeschel C.F.R. described as "a state similar to catatonic schizophrenia." The illness alone would suffice to explain her decline without resorting to diabolical causes, as some critics have attempted to do. She died on October 12, 1961.

Originally composed of 10,000 handwritten pages between 1943 and 1947, the published Poem is a 4,000-page Life of Christ in which scenes describing visions are interspersed with direct comments from Jesus and Mary. Valtorta could remember—and later clarify—what she said she saw in her visions, but not the dictation she recorded through a process resembling automatic writing. Valtorta's randomly generated texts were typed and arranged in Gospel chronology by Father Migliorini, who began circulating parts of them privately.

Sometime after April 1947, a bound copy of Valtorta's complete manuscript was sent to Pope Pius XII through the papal confessor. The pope received Father Migliorini and two other Servites in a special audience on February 26, 1948. His polite murmurs about the Poem are said to have included the phrase "publish this work as it is," which the Servites later recalled and

interpreted as a "Supreme Pontifical Imprimatur."

Although a pope could in theory grant such an imprimatur and even do so orally, no modern example of this has ever been produced. It is certain that a man as meticulous as Pius XII would have made his intentions perfectly clear and would not have allowed his words to be interpreted after the fact by interested parties.

It is impossible to determine which part of the Poem Pius XII actually read. Given the overwhelming responsibilities he faced as head of the post-war Church and the many crises he had to deal with as the Iron Curtain collapsed, how much time could the pope have devoted to reading and evaluating thousands of pages of manuscript?

After being harshly rejected by the Vatican press, the Poem was published by Italian publisher Emilio Pisani. On December 16, 1959, the Poem was condemned by the Holy Office, then headed by Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani. L'Osservatore Romano published this decree on January 6, 1960, accompanied by a hostile and unsigned critique of the Poem, entitled "A poorly fictionalized life of Jesus."

Valtorta's defenders attempt to attribute this and subsequent censorship to a secret "modernist clan" within the Holy Office. They offer no evidence of how the "modernists" were able to operate undetected by the strictly orthodox Ottaviani, nor of why modernist and other anti-Catholic books continued to appear on the Index from 1948 to 1960.

Furthermore, as Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Ottaviani's successor, stated, the abolition of the Index of Prohibited Books in 1966 did nothing to remedy the situation of previously banned works, including the Poem.

previously banned, including the Poem. In 1994, Ratzinger's office issued another statement through the apostolic nuncio to Canada, reiterating its judgment that Valtorta's works are simply fiction: "These writings cannot be recognized as being of supernatural origin." (The English edition of the Poem has been distributed in Canada since 1986 by Éditions Paulines in Sherbrooke, Quebec).

Furthermore, on April 17, 1993, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith asked the Italian Episcopal Conference to order the insertion of this warning in future reissues of the Poem: "...the 'visions' and 'dictations' referred to in this Poem are simply literary forms used by the author to recount the life of Jesus in his own way. They cannot be considered supernatural in origin."

From their inception in 1981, the Medjugorje apparitions have been mixed up with the Valtorta controversy, as pilgrimages to the Bosnian site have been the main vehicles for the dissemination of the Poem. Two of the visionaries, Maria Pavlovic and Vicka Ivankovic (who writes her own "inspired" Life of Mary), were asked about the Virgin's view of the work and reported a positive response. According to Vicka, "Our Lady says that the Poem of the Man-God is the truth." Several other visionaries, speakers, and prophets of the time echoed this sentiment. Is it healthy to consider private revelations as the ultimate arbiters of Catholic belief and practice?

2. Controversy, popularity, and fundamental flaw

But the Poem did not enchant everyone. In the early 1990s, disputes spread beyond to followers of Medjugorje to the entire Marian movement.

Marian movement. On one side were Leo Brodeur, Bishop Roman Danylak, Father René Laurentin, and Father Stefano Gobbi, while Paul Likoudis, Father Philip Pavich OFM, Jesuit Father Mitch Pacwa, and Father Brian Wilson, a Legionary of Christ, opposed them. But these debates focused mainly on how the Poem was placed on the Index and whether this condemnation was justified. The problems with the content received less attention. However, I wrote a general critique for ***Catholic International*** magazine in 2003.

Who am I to re-enter the fray at this late date? The eternal embers of the longest-standing hatred—anti-Semitism—are glowing again among some harsh Catholic conservatives who denounce
"globalism" and George Soros. I also have unique credentials. Although I am a mere laywoman and not a theologian, I received a traditional pre-Vatican II Catholic education, which I have put at the service of the Catholic press for 38 years. History is my field, and unlike all the other debaters I know, I have written, edited, and analyzed works of fiction professionally. I have read the Poem in the five-volume English edition (Centro Editoriale Valtortiano srl. Isola del Lira, Italy, 1986, reprinted in 1990) and consulted its online version retrieved from archive.org. (I have not examined the latest 2014 edition, The Gospel as Revealed to Me in ten volumes by the same publisher). Its defenders cannot accuse me of ignorance or of taking quotations out of context.

The Poem has reached hundreds of thousands of readers around the world in many languages, but its anti-Semitic elements seem to have gone unnoticed. These elements are associated with other reprehensible aspects that should have disqualified the work as serious spiritual literature, let alone as

an account of the life of Our Lord sent from heaven.

The fundamental flaw of the Poem is its claim to compensate for the shortcomings of the Gospels. As Jesus himself explains to Valtorta, the New Testament needs to be completed (I: p. 432) because of the "incorrigible Jewish mindset" of the evangelists. Their "flowery and pompous" Hebrew style prevented them from writing everything God wanted. (V: p. 947) So nineteen centuries later, he finds in Valtorta, his "little John," a secretary worthy of the name to develop what the apostle Saint John and the others wrote. "There is nothing of mine in this work," she insists. (I: p. 57) She presents herself as a mere transmitter of divine content.

But Hebrew is not a "flowery" language. Nor is Koine Greek, which is simple and concrete, in which at least three of the Gospels were composed. Moreover, the evangelist Luke was Greek and not Jewish. Nevertheless, Jesus denounced future critics of the Poem who would dare to look for errors "in this work of divine goodness." (V: pp. 751-52) The Poem is self-authenticating, and any discrepancies were introduced by Jesus himself. (V: p. 753)

Valtorta's prose, however, is extremely flowery. Take, for example, the description, on one page, of the newborn Mary (I: pp. 24-25), where her fists "are two rosebuds that split open the green of their petals and show their silk inside." The stylistic devices she uses are monotonous: flowers, jewels, and fabrics. The literary effect is further hampered by her taste for exotic words ("noctules" for bats) and the translators' clumsiness (a line of loaded donkeys is rendered as an "asinian cavalcade").

The Poem also claims to "correct" the text

received from Scripture. Valtorta's reading of John 2:4 adds a new "now" to Christ's remark about the wine at Cana, thus turning it into a comment on their own relationship: "Woman, what is there now between me and you? (I: pp. 283-84) But this reading has no basis in the Vulgate or in any modern vernacular translation of the original Greek. The Poem places itself above the Bible and the "Little John," safe from any criticism.

Although it claims to be purely celestial in origin, the Poem incorporates elements drawn from the Apocrypha (e.g., the Acts of Saint Paul and Saint Thecla), the Golden Legend, the Meditations of Pseudo-Bonaventure, the revelations of Saint Bridget, and other medieval texts. (Does it borrow from Carmen when Mary Magdalene tries to attract Jesus' attention by throwing a rose at him?) Valtorta disagrees with the revelations of Mary of Agreda and Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich regarding the chronology, family relationships, and details of key events such as the Passion and the Assumption. For example, in the Poem, Mary lives and dies in Jerusalem, not in Ephesus as the other two visionaries say. The personal stories of the Apostles, on the other hand, are not traditional. Peter is a middle-aged buffoon; Simon is a true "Canaanite" and not Jesus' cousin. Judas receives much more attention than all the other apostles combined.

3. An imaginary world strewn with flowers and a Jesus who fulminates

Valtorta is said to have used only the Bible and the Catechism of Pius X as references. It is impossible to know what she may have absorbed earlier in her schooling, her

readings, sermons, or conversations. The little she knew about Palestine and first-century Jerusalem may have come from maps and study aids commonly found in Catholic Bibles. For the rest, it is an imaginary world strewn with flowers. Her landscapes, settings, props, and costumes are reminiscent of soft, gilded Italian holy cards.

She is surprisingly ignorant of local living conditions. Her houses resemble Italian farmhouses with chimneys, porches, and vegetable gardens. The wealthy enjoy jasmine pergolas and gardens bordered by hedges and enclosed by iron gates. The countryside is full of apple orchards, rye fields, cacti, and agaves. Apples are everywhere. Dates, figs, and olives are rare; there are never any lentils, chickpeas, or onions. People commonly drink fresh milk, even honey water and cider, but wine hardly ever appears. Screwdrivers and horseshoes are used, even though they were unknown in ancient Palestine.

Valtorta acknowledges her confusion about the layout of the temple, but continues to imagine it incorrectly with multiple golden domes, angel-headed capitals, and a choir of young girls. Not only does Jesus have a bar mitzvah, a ceremony that did not yet exist, but everything described is false, right down to the name of the biblical book he reads as a "test" administered by a bored Temple official. Although it is taboo to pronounce the divine name, Jesus himself says "Yahweh." The word "Jehovah," unknown in ancient times, is freely used by other speakers, including Mary and Peter.

But Valtorta's anachronisms are far from being as questionable as his distorted characterizations of Jesus and Mary. They are, of course, blond, blue-eyed, with

and straight noses, quite unlike the dark-skinned Jews around them. A pale complexion is generally, but not necessarily, a sign of great holiness. (Note that Mary Magdalene and John the Younger are fair-skinned, while Judas is dark-skinned). A hooked nose, on the other hand, is always a disturbing feature.

Our Lord is a hypersensitive and furious mama's boy, whose naked body "resembles a delicate lady." (V: p. 564) His last word on the Cross is, in fact, "Mother." (V: p. 620) Jesus must summon supreme willpower to contain his aversion to sinful humanity: "My first contacts with the world had made me sick and depressed. It was too ugly." (I: p. 432) He would rather touch a corpse than an impure person. "I feel such disgust for debauchery that it upsets me." (I: pp. 695-96)
"He never laughs." (I: p. 282, italics in the original) He also demonstrates his sublime purity to a prostitute sent to tempt him by trampling on a "lascivious" caterpillar. (IV: p. 785) Needless to say, this gesture helps him repent.

Calling himself "God-Man," Jesus openly proclaims his divinity and messiahship from the beginning of his public life. He baptizes his apostles with kisses and preaches all the doctrines of the catechism. The Decalogue is the only part of the Mosaic Law that Jesus accepts; everything else is a priestly addition. (I: p. 273) But aren't Leviticus and Deuteronomy books of the Bible? Souls go to heaven before his Passion and Resurrection. (I: p. 263) Incredibly, the wounds of the risen Christ, his "stigmata," still hurt and his joints are stiff. (V: pp. 762-64)

His disciples are already called "Christians" before the founding of the Church (V: p. 253), despite the contrary biblical testimony (Acts 11:26). He even denies that

Christian beliefs developed over time because he had already delivered them all, using correct terminology, while he was on earth. (V: 946) The Poem is not a "new" revelation added since the death of the last apostle, as it only offers elements that the evangelists left out.

Mary, whom Jesus calls "the second born of the Father" (I: p. 7) and "the second after Peter in the ecclesiastical hierarchy" (IV: p. 240), boasts of her unique exemption from the "torment of generation" (I: 115) during the labor pains of her cousin Elizabeth. After the crucifixion, she breaks out into a morbid hysteria with incestuous overtones (V: pp. 630-59). The weeping Virgin proclaims her hatred of men, whom she compares to wolves, snakes, and hyenas. "Man disgusts and frightens me" (V: p. 640). However, in the dictation the following day, Jesus praises the patience and love of the sorrowful Mother and her forgiveness (V: 670). Then, in a final twist in his message to the Poem, Jesus excuses his Mother's emotionality on the grounds of her ethnicity, for "they should consider Mary's nationality. Hebrew race, Eastern race, and a time very distant from the present. The explanation for certain verbal amplifications, which may seem exaggerated to you, therefore stems from these elements." (V: 947) Valtorta really could not remember what she had written after putting it down on paper.

The Poem provokes several secondary plots invented by "delicate" young girls narrowly escaping a fate worse than death and guilt-ridden prostitutes sinking into total degradation. In a particularly insipid moment, Herod tries to tempt the captive Jesus with his lascivious African dancers who "lightly touch Christ with their naked bodies." (V: p. 562)

Despite the vaguely homoerotic flavor of Christ's frequent kisses, hugs, and caresses toward his disciples, Valtorta feels an almost Gnostic distaste for sexuality. For Jesus, all humans are nothing but souls. She asserts that humanity before the Fall would have reproduced asexually. The original sin was Eve's perverse adventure with the serpent, followed by sexual intercourse with Adam (I: p. 83). Now, sexual satisfaction is "bread made of ashes and excrement" (I: p. 665). She never admits that it can be lawful within marriage.

Jesus' sermon on the sixth commandment, more vehement and accusatory than on the other nine, betrays an uncertain understanding of human reproduction (I: p.664). Contraception and abortion were not common in New Testament times. Jesus absurdly asserts that animals mate soberly, solely for the purpose of procreation. (I: p. 30) Can the God-Man not know male dogs? He also teaches that the child only exists after a human embryo has begun to take shape. (I: 635).

4. Valtorta's deplorable anti-Semitism

But Valtorta's worst fault is his deplorable anti-Semitism, both religious and racial, which taints the entire Poem. Opposed to the Roman soldiers, Valtorta's cowardly, smelly, big-nosed dark-skinned men are stereotypes straight out of The Eternal Jew. For the Romans, Jewish corpses are "so many snakes less." ." (V: p. 623) The legionnaires cheerfully insult the Jewish crowd, which they disperse with their fists. (IV: p. 804) Pilate's confrontation with a delegation from the Sanhedrin is an exercise

embarrassing exercise in vulgar comedy, with Pilate sniffing a flower to remove the smell of "goat" from the Jews. (V: pp. 557 ff.).

Valtorta repeatedly compares the Jews to the Romans: "Hebrew wombs conceive vile traitors. Roman wombs conceive only heroes." (V: p. 790) Mary Salome calls the Jews "cowards" but considers their Roman conquerors "just and peaceful." (V: p. 652) Mary Magdalene assumes that converted Jews will not be brave enough to become martyrs. (V: p. 663) Pagans will be better disciples of God than Israel was. (V: p. 852) It is significant that Valtorta's account of Pentecost does not culminate with the conversion of 3,000 Jews. Assuming that the early Christians immediately changed their Sabbath to Sunday, she is unaware of the slow distancing of the synagogue and the Church recounted in the Acts of the Apostles.

Mary gets carried away, saying that Rome was right to fear this "tribe of murderers." (V: p. 642). She declares:
"I am no longer a Jew, but a Christian, the first Christian." A fictional Jewish character converts because
"the worship of Israel has become Satanism" and promptly breaks the Sabbath. (V: p. 673). Nicodemus, who has discarded his Hebrew identity, plans to sculpt a statue, the future Holy Face of Lucca. (V: p. 903)

Even more seriously, Valtorta makes the Jews into Christ killers. The Romans are not responsible for the crucifixion, only Pilate is. Apart from the disciples of Christ, "all the Jewish people gathered in Jerusalem wanted him dead." (V: p. 293). The entire city pours out to mock Jesus like thousands of
"rabid hyenas" (V: p. 566). Longinus and the Roman soldiers try to minimize his suffering, but executioners with "obvious Jewish features" (V: p. 563) flog the

Savior and nail him to the ground. Christ's plea, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," seems to be addressed to the quarreling thieves, not to his "diabolical Jewish persecutors."

As his Passion approaches, Jesus complains about the Jews' resistance to conversion: "How painful it is to be so close to death for so few people." (V: p. 64) He hates Jewish worship: "I hate your solemnities, which are only appearances. I will abolish my covenant with the root of Levi..." (V: p. 426). Later, the risen Christ declares that God has withdrawn from Jewish rites and that Judaism is
"dead forever." "Its rituals are nothing but gestures that any histrionic actor could mimic on the stage of an amphitheater." (V: p. 831) He despises Jerusalem as the place where the synagogue received the blame for God's repudiation for its many and horrible crimes." (V: p. 869)

To quote thunderous eternal curses against the people and land of Israel as the very words of Our Lord Jesus Christ while the flames of the Holocaust burned is detestable blasphemy.

Conclusion

Why, during all these years, have so few readers of the Poem noticed its glaring flaws? Have they obediently followed the recommendations of those they admired as spiritual leaders? Certainly, few in the audience shared the contempt for Jews and Judaism expressed in the Poem. Or does this phenomenon demonstrate the reader reception theory: that people see what they want to see in a text? Countless fervent testimonials to "this great and glorious work" suggest that this may be the case, especially since its promoters advised reading it slowly and meditatively. In my opinion, the cult of

Maria Valtorta was a tragic waste of devotional time, treasure, and zeal, as well as the life of an unfortunate woman.

To have written such things while fires burned in Auschwitz is pure obscenity. Valtorta is a unique argument in favor of *Nostrae aetate*, the Vatican II decree that condemned the notion of collective guilt of the Jews.

This is only a small sample of the many and omnipresent errors de Valtorta.
"Infantilism, fantasy, false history, and exegesis" make the Poem exactly what an anonymous author quoted by Cardinal Ratzinger said it was: "a monument of pseudo-religiosity."

END OF SANDRA MIESEL'S ARTICLE - Sept. 14, 2021

Theological Error No. 201: Women will be priests of a lower order

157.2 (...) And through the woman, the beloved of the Lord, all women will be able to become disciples of the Lord, not only as the masses, but as priestesses of a lower order, coadjutors of priests whom they can help so much, for themselves, for the faithful, and for those who are not faithful, for those whom will bring to God not so much the roar of the holy word as the holy smile of one of my disciples. May *7,* 1945. T3ch17. T2ch157.

First of all, note Valtorta's sexism, since women will bring the faithful to God through their
"holy smiles," while men will make the holy word roar. Everyone has their place, and according to Valtorta's Jesus, women's place seems to be smiling.

The error lies in the fact that men and women are spiritually priests, through their inner priesthood, equal to one another. The expression
"priestesses of a lower order" is false. It should have been
"inner priestesses, spiritual priestesses," just as simple lay faithful men are spiritual priests, inner priests.

The *Roman Catechism*, known as the Catechism of the Council of Trent, ch. XXVI: On the Sacrament of Holy Orders, § VII. On the Priesthood, expounds this doctrine of the interior priesthood of the faithful:

"But since the Holy Scriptures [= the Bible] distinguish between two priesthoods, one internal and the other external, it is necessary to characterize both, so that pastors may explain which priesthood is meant here.

Thus, when we say that the faithful purified by the water of Baptism are priests, we are speaking of an interior priesthood. In the same order of ideas, all the just are priests, who have the spirit of God within them and who, through a benefit of grace, have become living members of the supreme Priest, who is Our Lord Jesus Christ. For they offer spiritual sacrifices to God on the altar of their hearts whenever, enlightened by faith and inflamed by charity, they do good and honest works which they offer to the glory of God. That is why we read in Revelation 1:5: "Jesus Christ has washed us from our sins in his blood, and he has made us kings and priests for God his Father." This is also what led the prince of the Apostles to say in 1 Peter 2:5: "You are being built into a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." It is also for this reason that the Apostle exhorts us in Romans 12:1 : "Present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, in order to do his will."

a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing to him, and to worship him in spirit." Finally, long before, David had said in Psalm 50:19: "The sacrifice you desire is a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, you will not despise." All this, of course, refers to the interior priesthood.

As for the external priesthood, it does not belong to all the faithful, but only to certain men who have received the laying on of hands in a legitimate manner; who have been ordained and consecrated to God with the solemn ceremonies of the Holy Church, and who, by virtue of this, find themselves devoted to a sacred ministry of a very special nature.

Yet another case of gibberish that distances readers from the teachings of the Catholic faith.

Indecency No. 149: The Holy Spirit said, *"Be silent,"* to Mary.

Indecency No. 150: The Holy Spirit does not cover Mary with his shadow, he "enters" into her.

Note No. 3: The expression "seed of God" is not appropriate.

18.7 - Mary said: (...) the Holy Spirit who filled me had advised me: "Be silent. Leave it to me to justify you to your husband." (...) If he had not told me, "Be silent," I might have dared, with my face to the ground, to announce to Joseph, "The Spirit has entered me, and I carry within me the Seed of God." And he would have believed me (...) Saturday, March 25, 1944. T1ch28 T1ch18.

Couldn't God the Holy Spirit have told her, "Keep

silent"?
Couldn't the Holy Spirit "come upon" her?

Vulgarity No. 3: Saint Joseph, the "honest man" whom Mary turned into an angel.

29.11 (...) Mary: *Instead of bringing down, I have always drawn people to the heights, and I have made my companion, who was an honest man, into an angel (...) Catechesis of Tuesday, June 6, 1944. T1ch48. T1ch29.*

To describe St. Joseph, one of the greatest saints, as an honest man is vulgar and mediocre. Mary boasts that she "draws him to the heights" and that she is the one who made him a saint.

Note: St. John the Baptist was sanctified in his mother's womb.

567.16 (...) Between the soul of John, I speak of the Baptist, and yours, [Judas]*, there was no difference when they were infused into the flesh. And yet I tell you that even if Grace had not pre-sanctified him, so that the Herald of Christ might be without stain (...)*. February 15, 1947.

Vulgarity No. 4: Mary speaks of "females."

29.12 Mary: *(...) The female whom I reconsecrated as a woman on Christmas night (...) You, reduced by Eve to be females no better than the companions of animals (...)*
Catechesis of June 6, 1944. T1ch48. T1ch29.

Vulgarity No. 5: Jesus describes John as a "lamb that has never been shorn."

70.5 (...) Listen, John. I beg you to be a friend to him. My heart trembles to place you, a lamb never yet shorn, beside the one who knows life. (...) January 4, 1945. T2ch33. T1ch70. This expression "lamb never yet shorn" seems unfortunate to us.

Vulgarity No. 6: Jesus' love will take the place of a woman for St. John.

49.2 (…) *"Master... I don't know... it seems to me, if it's not pride to say so, that your special love will be like a father and mother, brothers and sisters, and even a wife to me. I will be satisfied with everything, yes, everything, if you love me."* Friday, October 13, 1944. T2ch10. T1ch49.

Vulgarity No. 7: Mary says of Jesus: "my creature."

(...) Elizabeth! (...) Tell me: what must my Creature do to save the world? (...) Elizabeth! ... Elizabeth! ... What will they do to my Creature? (...) Vision of April 2, 1944. T1ch33. T1ch22.

Vulgarity No. 8: Mary caresses a young shepherd.

22.5 (…) "Are you back from the pasture?" Mary says to a young shepherd whom she caresses.
Vision of April 2, 1944. T1ch33. T1ch22.

Vulgarity No. 9: "a golden sparkle at the tip of each hair."

[Jesus's] *eyebrows and eyelashes were thick, but not too thick, long, beautiful, light brown, but with a golden sparkle at the tip of each hair. Notebooks, April 7, 1944*

Vulgarity No. 10: Jesus evokes Anne's caresses on Joachim during their wedding night.

3.7- "Having become an old woman, wife of Joachim for decades, she remained for him 'the wife of his youth, his joy, his beloved doe, his graceful gazelle,' whose caresses retained the freshness and enchantment of their first wedding night and gently charmed his love; he remained as fresh as a flower damp with dew and ardent as a fire that a hand never ceases to feed." Catechesis of Wednesday, August 23, 1944. T1ch4. T1ch3.

Did Saint Anne, now elderly, caress Saint Joachim in a way that preserved the freshness and enchantment of their wedding night? We are happy to learn that the wedding night between Saint Anne and Saint Joachim went well, but is it really the role of a private revelation to tell us about this? Doesn't this statement end up ridiculing Jesus?

Vulgarity No. 11: Zachariah "the poor old man."

23.7 *(...)* Zachariah *(...) he weeps, the poor old man. (...) Mary places the child near its mother and caresses it, smoothing its gray hair. Vision of Monday, April 3, 1944. T1ch36. T1ch23.*

Vulgarity No. 12: Jesus says that his mother "did not even know the instinctive urge of the flesh."

348.11 (...) the Virgin (...) did not even know the instinctive urge of the flesh, fainted before the Angel of the Lord, because even an angel disturbs the humility and modesty of the Virgin (...) Sunday, December 2, 1945. T5ch36. T5ch348.

Vulgarity No. 13: Jesus speaks of "lukewarm breasts" and twins who taste "the taste of their brother's saliva."

406.5 (...) Judas (...) I have wanted to speak to you like this for so long, holding you to my heart, like twins in a single cradle, born together, almost one flesh, two children who exchanged warm breasts and tasted their brother's saliva at the same time as the sweetness of their mother's milk. Now I have you and I will never leave you (...)
September 20, 1944. T6ch95. T6ch406.

Vulgarity No. 14: Jesus says that his mother was "without blemish."

Oddity No. 3: Jesus speaks of races: "Hebrew race, Eastern race."

(...) *To those who find Mary's love for Jesus too affectionate, I say consider who Mary was: the Woman without sin and therefore without blemish for her charity towards God (...) consider Mary's nationality. Hebrew race, Eastern race (...) All the writings of that time and of that race are proof of this (...) Feb. 3, 1947. T10ch38. p. 298, T10ch652.*

Indecency No. 148: exposing a very young girl to the eyes of a crowd.

98.11 (...) Do not reveal your kindness, as you would not reveal a very young girl to the eyes of a crowd (...) Vision February 5, 1945. T2ch63. T2ch98. (about almsgiving in secret.)

Monsignor Giovanni Pepe, appointed by Pope Pius XII to examine the life and work of Maria Valtorta on behalf of the Holy See: "Valtorta sacrilegiously places shameful language on the divine lips of Jesus in an essay from the 'dictations.'" It is indeed impossible to imagine Jesus using such a trivial and obscene image.

Vulgarity No. 15: The Virgin Mary did not give off any bad odors just before ascending to Heaven.

650.1 (...) Mary's body is as it was when she had just expired. There is no sign of death on her face or on her little hands. There is no unpleasant odor in the room. On the contrary, there is an indefinable fragrance (...) Dec. 8, 1951. T10ch36. T10ch650.

Why is it useful to say that it did not smell bad? Is the intention to ridicule this magnificent episode of the Assumption of Mary?

Vulgarity No. 16: "The female I had re-consecrated"
"You are reduced to being females no better than the companions of animals."

29.11 (...) I had to be the Chaste One to reduce to nothing the Unchaste One of the flesh, of the heart, and of the spirit. I did not abandon this restraint, not even when speaking of my Son, who

was mine alone on earth as he was God's alone in Heaven: "This is mine, I want him."
29.12 (...) seeing Him whom you saw born die. Feeling my entrails torn out by the cry of my dying Creature, I emptied myself of all femininity: I was no longer flesh, but an angel. Mary (...) died at that moment (...) The female whom I had reconsecrated as a woman on Christmas night acquired at the foot of the Cross the means to become a creature of Heaven (...) From you, reduced by Eve to being females no better than the companions of animals, I have made, provided you wish it, the saints of God (...) Catechesis, June 6, 1944. T1ch48. T1ch29.

These words put into the mouth of the Virgin Mary are infamous. There is no dignity in these crude and trivial expressions.

Oddity No. 4: Mary empties herself of all feminism.

Italian: Nel sentirmi strappare le viscere al grido della mia Creatura che moriva, sono rimasta vuota di ogni femminismo: non più carne ma angelo.

Vulgarity No. 17: God takes his "revenge" on Satan.

5.12 (...) "Come to Me, you who wipe away the bitterness of human disobedience, of human fornication with Satan, and of human ingratitude. I will take my revenge on Satan with you" (...)
5.14 – God's revenge! Siffe, O Satan, your hatred as it is born (...) O perpetual corrupter, and there is no wind strong enough to dispel the stench of your breath (...) His breath purifies the world of your stench (...) O accursed one, who has taken from God the joy of being the Father of all created men! (...) God's sublime revenge on Satan's vengeance was to raise the beloved creature

of the beloved creature to a super-perfection which, at least in one creature, neutralized all memory of humanity, capable of giving access to Satan's poison (...) 5.15 – The Virginity of the Virgin! (...) Behold the revenge of the Triune God (...) August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

It is inappropriate and vulgar to speak of "revenge on Satan." This idea of a vengeful God demeans God and is unworthy of Him. God dominates Satan to such an extent that Satan's greatest confusion at the Last Judgment will be to realize that his evil actions have only served to glorify God and His elect. This is one of the great mysteries of Creation and Redemption. St. Paul to the Romans, 8 ([28]) *We know, moreover, that all things work together for good for those who love God, who are called according to his eternal purpose.* God allows evil because He knows how to bring about a greater good. Satan has taken nothing away from God. This way of expressing it gives too much importance to Satan and is not worthy of the mystery of Redemption. Satan, in comparison with God, is less than a grain of sand in the desert. Valtorta gives him far too much importance and forgets the flesh and the world, which are also our enemies. Three fight against us: Satan, the world, and our flesh. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica,* Prima Pars, Q. 2, art. 3: "As St. Augustine says (Enchrid., chap. 11), God being supremely good, He would never allow anything evil to exist in His works if He did not have enough power and goodness to bring good out of evil itself. It therefore belongs to His infinite goodness to allow evil to exist and to bring good out of it."

Rebuke No. 1: ***5.10 Leave aside your publications filled with obscure, putrid, dirty, venomous, lying, blasphemous, and corrupting things.***

Reprimand No. 2: ***5.10 (...) although (...) you are still, each one of you, corrupt, proud, lustful, murderous,***

God still allows you to enjoy the beauty of the universe and treats you as if you were good. August 27, 1944. T1ch8. T1ch5.

Reprimand No. 3: 90% of you live to satisfy your lust, for debauchery.

17.21 (...) currently, nine-tenths of you are like Eve (...) you live (...) to satisfy your lust, (...) for debauchery. You (...) are soulless and mindless dogs. You have killed your soul and depraved your reason (...) wild beasts surpass you in the honesty of their love." March 8, 1944. T1ch26. T1ch17

Note No. 4: Maria Valtorta lives in fear of deceiving herself and others.

10.11 (...) [Maria Valtorta:] *My constant fear ceases... until the next time. Indeed, it will never cease to accompany me, this fear of deceiving myself and deceiving others.*
Catechesis, September 2, 1944. T1ch17. T1ch10.

This constant fear of Maria Valtorta contradicts the seventh note of true apparitions: *peace and tranquility of mind (cf.* Mgr Ludovic Chaillot, *Les Principes de la Théologie Mystique*, Paris, Louis Hervé Libraire Éditeur, 1866). *Among the signs favorable to the revelations of St.*

Teresa [of Avila], [Cardinal] Bona points to the tranquility and joy of her soul.

Instead of being at peace within herself, which is what happens during true supernatural apparitions, Valtorta lives in fear. True mystics seek above all to fulfill God's will and submit themselves to their bishop and to the Holy See. The documents of the Holy Office prove that Pope Pius XII approved the decisions condemning Maria Valtorta's writings as early as 1946 and 1949.

If it was Heaven speaking to Maria Valtorta, God would have warned her that Father Berti was seriously disobeying the Holy See by refusing to hand over the manuscripts requested by the Holy Office; Father Berti relinquished them and returned them to Maria Valtorta. Furthermore, the number of corrections made by Maria Valtorta to her text proves that she suspected that something was wrong, because if Jesus was the author of the dictations and visions, she would have had nothing to correct. Is He not God? Is He not capable of speaking about faith, theology, and the Gospels without making serious topographical, geographical, historical, sociological, theological, and exegetical errors?

Oddity No. 5: Mary is anxious even though Joseph has fully accepted and shared her vow of perpetual virginity and the miracle of the flowering branch proves God's approval of this plan.

14.2 (...) *Mary looks <u>with the anxious gaze</u> of someone who wants to know and even recognize what she sees but cannot remember, and she smiles when some vague memory returns and lingers on this or that, on a particular point. T1ch22. T1ch14.*

Oddity No. 6: Jesus, St. John, and Mary are blond with blue eyes.

Joseph contemplates Mary's blond head bent over her embroidery. March 25, 1944. T1ch27. T1. ch18.

Oddity No. 7: Mary appears (...) blonde like an angel.

Mary appears beautiful as a flower. White and blonde like an angel, she smiles kindly at the children who throw flowers at her and blow her kisses (...). Anc. T1 ch22. Nv. T1 ch14.

Indecency No. 151: Jesus proposes a book burning.

*Jesus: "Truly I tell you, it would be much more useful for you to throw into the fire so much useless, dusty, and unhealthy knowledge to make room for my books, than to know so little about Me and to worship these printed pages, which are almost always stained with impurity and heresy." February 3, 1947. T10ch38. p. 298, T10ch652. (*Error noted by Father Guillaume Chevallier).

Is it a good idea, in the context of the new evangelization decreed by Saint John Paul II, to propose this? Is the intention to ridicule Jesus? Who cannot see that such a foolish idea can only come from a human psyche or a demon? The contempt of "Jesus" here for everything that does not come from him is mind-boggling.

Note No. 5: Jesus tells a peasant that his mother is now pouring out her gifts of love on him.

89.1 (...) Jonas, "miserable peasant" (...) Oh, if only I could see your Mother! (...) "I will bring her to you" (...) And think that even now She is showering her gifts

of love upon you (...) Jesus caresses the old man's defeated face again (...) Jan. 27, 1945. T. 2ch54. T2ch89.
It is wrong to imagine Jesus expressing such a truth during his public life. Did Jesus distribute rosaries to his apostles?

Note No. 6: Eagerness and tenderness between Jesus and John.

70.1 (...) Your disciple John has come (...) "Has he been here long?" "No, he just went down that path. (...) Jesus sets off quickly, running in the other direction. He sees John (...) and calls out to him. The disciple turns around and, his face lit up with joy, he cries out (...) he runs back. Jesus opens his arms and they embrace each other affectionately. (...) John leans down affectionately to take Jesus' hand. He kisses it and runs it over his face as if to caress him. (...) 70.2 (...) "But where will your disciple sleep?" "With me. There is still room for him on my mat, isn't there, John?" John is delighted at the thought of sleeping next to Jesus. 70.3 (...) "Let's sit here and talk (...) John prefers to sit at his feet (...) with his arm resting on Jesus' knees, his head resting on his arm, glancing from time to time at his Jesus (...) 70.7 (...) Jesus recites psalms and John joins in, but his voice fades and the apostle falls asleep, his head on Jesus' breast, who smiles and spreads his cloak over the sleeper's shoulders and then surely continues to pray silently (...). January *4*, 1945. T2ch33. T1ch70.
Giovanni, at the idea of sleeping next to Jesus, goes into <u>ecstasy</u>.

Some have denounced a homoerotic atmosphere between Jesus and St. John, but this is not our interpretation. What is most striking about this episode is Jesus' rush to find St. John: he "runs quickly, leaps." This could suggest a lack of control over his passions on Jesus' part, which is not the case.

That said, we are convinced, particularly because of the tenderness between Jesus and St. John at the Last Supper on Holy Thursday, that Valtorta had a good intuition about the great human warmth between Jesus and his favorite disciple. St. John was of angelic purity, and his love of friendship was perhaps extremely strong, without any sexual ambiguity. It should be noted that what is translated here as "John is delighted to sleep next to Jesus" was translated in the first French translation as "John is ecstatic at the thought of sleeping next to Jesus," which is indeed the word ecstasy in the Italian text. This obviously provoked reactions (see Abbé Gerard Herrbach, fsspx, *Des Visions sur l'Évangile,* France, Eguelshardt, 1993*)*. The new translation attempts to camouflage what MV wrote in order to avoid criticism, but is this honest?

Note No. 7: Mary does not know that Judas has hanged himself and is already in hell.

611.6 (...) the Iscariot. We must... yes, we must look for him, even him... for he is the greatest sinner..." Mary remains with her head bowed on her chest, trembling as if in disgust, and then she says: "John, you will look for him and bring him to me. You must do it, and I must do it. Father, let even this be done for the redemption of humanity. Let us go." (...) Vision of March 28, 1945. T9ch31. T10ch611.

If Mary does not know that Judas is already damned in hell, it is because she is unaware of what Jesus said repeatedly about Judas. Matthew 26 [24] "The Son of Man is going as it is written about him, but woe to that man who betrays him. It would be better for that man if he had never been born." ([25])Judas, who betrayed him, spoke up and said, "Is it I, Master?" "You said it," Jesus replied. John 6 ([70]) Jesus answered them, "(...) one of you is a devil." John 17 ([12]) (...) "those whom you

have given me, and none of them is lost, except the son of perdition (...)".

Vulgarity No. 18: "Heavy burden" of St. Joseph's humanity.

31.6 - Mary then said to me: (...) I raise you up (...) by showing you the holiness of Joseph (...) he was not immaculate. He carried within him humanity with its heavy burden and he had to rise to perfection with all that weight, at the cost of unceasing effort.
Catechesis of Thursday, June 8, 1944. T1ch52. T1ch31.

The question of whether St. Joseph was cleansed of original sin and its effects in order to be worthy of marrying the Virgin Mary and being the educator of Jesus is freely debated. Maria Valtorta does not commit any doctrinal error, but it seems more appropriate to St. Joseph's mission that God granted him the grace of not bearing the consequences of original sin. We are inclined to believe that St. Joseph is one of the greatest saints of all humanity.

Note No. 8: Mary caresses a lot in Maria Valtorta.

Mary (...) caresses the gentle animals that pass by brushing against her mount (...) Mary smiles as she caresses the little pink muzzle of the lamb that bleats desperately (...).
Vision of Monday, March 27, 1944. T1ch29. T1ch19.

Note No. 9: The lie of the notebooks without deletions.

Maria Valtorta corrects her "visions" or "dictations" in the version typed at the machine at write, the version "typed," thus dispelling the myth of 12,000 pages of

written notebooks without erasures are shattered. What is the point of pretending that one writes without erasures, if one then finds oneself obliged to delete and replace words in the typed version? Acting in this way is tantamount to erasing the manuscript, since one is changing the text that one has written. She was unable to write a sentence correctly without having to change it and correct it afterwards. Furthermore, Valtortists hide the pages of Maria Valtorta's notebooks, and I have seen at least one on a Valtortist website that contains a clearly visible correction. The fact that the manuscripts are not scanned and accessible on the internet is extremely suspicious, as this is easy to do nowadays.
https://www.maria-valtorta.org/Publication/TOME%2001/01-006.htm in note [5]

Note No. 3: More than 66% will go to hell; Jesus died in vain for them.

Truly, I tell you that more than two-thirds of the human race belong to this category who live under the sign of the Beast. For them, I died in vain. The law of those who bear the sign of the Beast is opposed to my Law. In one, the flesh dominates, which produces the works of the flesh. In the other, the spirit dominates, which produces the works of the spirit. Where the spirit dominates is the reign of God; where the flesh dominates is the reign of Satan. Catechesis of June 7, 1943. Cahiers de 1943.

This theological opinion of the "small number of the elect" is in line with what a famous French historian, Jean Delumeau (+), wrote in his book *Le Péché et la Peur* (Sin and Fear) (Paris, Fayard, Oct. 1984, p. 317): "It must be noted as a historical fact that the most eminent representatives of Western Christian thought from the end of Antiquity to the 19th century agreed on the small number of the elect

." On this subject, see the article by another great French historian, Guillaume Cuchet, *Une révolution théologique oubliée. Le triomphe de la thèse du grand nombre des élus dans le discours catholique du XIXe siècle* (A *forgotten theological revolution. The triumph of the thesis of the large number of the elect in* 19th-century Catholic discourse*).*

Mediocrity of style: many things are "small"

the little clogs that jostle
drinking from a spring whose water flows from a small cave Now
Marie looks like a little brother with the hood framing her face
Vision of Monday, March 27, 1944. T1ch29. T1ch19.
The bright red of her little mouth and the soft splendor of her azure eyes
covering half of her little pink ears
Vision of Tuesday, March 28, 1944. T1ch30. T1ch20.

The property is surrounded by a small white wall (...) A small woman (...) points out a strange arrangement that serves as a bell. (...) The woman, a little old lady, (...) is joined by a little old man who is limping. He must be a gardener (...) thanking the little old woman (...) The little old man bows and greets her (...) to get rid of the importunate little old woman. Vision April 2, 1944, T1 ch33 T1ch22.

(...) VM: My Jesus! What will he be like?" (...) a small mouth as red as a slice of pomegranate (...) and two small hands that could fit in (...) a lily, so small and beautiful are they, and two small feet (...) the bleating of a little lamb that has just been born and is looking for its mother's teat (...) I can be in love with Him, because He is my God and my lover's love does not conflict with my vow of virginity. (...) the joyful cooing of a little dove (...) His Mother who will support His little pink feet (...) Vision of Sunday, April 2, 1944. T1ch34. T1ch22.

(...) I feel his little heart beating close to my chest and I feel as if I have a little bird in my nest because of the light beating of his little heart (...)

37.1 - I see (...) my Jesus appear, a little boy of about five years old, all blond (...) He is playing in the little garden with some dirt. He makes little piles and plants little branches in them (...) he wants to make a little lake at the foot of these tiny hills (...) he fills it with water (...) to water the little garden (...)
Vision of March 21, 1944. T1ch62. T1ch37.

52.4 (...) Mary (...) simply places her little white hand on Jesus' shoulder and brushes a curl from his long hair. January 16, 1944

Scientific error No. 40: At Easter, the Jews cut the roast lamb into slices with a knife.

600.7 (...) Jesus cuts the lamb (...) Jesus distributes the portions, making sure that everyone is well served, just like a father among his sons (...)
March 9, 1945. T9ch19 - T9ch600
600.12 (...) When the psalm was finished, while Jesus was cutting slices of the lamb and presenting them, Matthew asked Judas of Kerioth (...) March 9, 1945. T9ch19 - T9ch600

According to Valtorta, at the Last Supper, Jesus cut slices of lamb, but meat was not cut into slices as it is today. Roast lamb was eaten with the fingers, especially at Passover. There was no elaborate cutting with knives into thin slices as in the modern world. The cooking was organized so as to tenderize the meat so that pieces could easily be detached with the fingers.

15 Errors in The Wedding at Cana

Visions of January 16, 1944. T2ch14 T1ch52

Theological Error No. 202: Valtorta removes five and a half verses out of the twelve verses that make up the Wedding at Cana

Gospel according to Saint John, chapter 2:

1 And on the third day there was a wedding in Cana in Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there.
2Jesus was also invited to the wedding with his disciples.
3 When the wine ran out, Jesus' mother said to him, "They have no wine."
4 Jesus replied, "Woman, what do you want from me? **My time has not yet come."**
5His mother said to the servants, "Do whatever he tells you."
6 Now there were six stone water jars there for the Jewish rites of purification, each holding twenty or thirty gallons.
7 Jesus said to them, "Fill the jars with water." And they filled them up to the brim.
8 Then he said to them, "Now draw some out and take it to the master of the banquet." So they took it to him.
9 When the master of the banquet tasted the water that had been turned into wine, he did not know where it came from, but the servants who had drawn the water knew. So he called the bridegroom and said to him, (10)"Everyone serves the good wine first, and when the guests have drunk freely, they serve the inferior wine; but you have kept the good wine until now."
11 This was the first of the signs that Jesus performed in Cana of Galilee, and he revealed his glory, and his disciples believed in him.
12 After this, he went down to Capernaum with his mother, his brothers, and his disciples, and they stayed there only a few days.

MV removes five entire verses and half of verse 4, and this part is very important: verses 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are simply deleted. This deletion is made because it contradicts the false view proposed by MV. The two versions are incompatible: either MV is right, or the Gospel according to Saint John is right and tells the truth about what really happened at the wedding at Cana.

Scientific error No. 41: The women add cutlery to the table, even though Jews did not use it.

52.5 (...) *the women busied themselves adding seats and cutlery for the three guests who were not expected.*

At that time in Palestine, people ate without cutlery, using their right hand and pieces of bread; they served themselves directly from the dish. Even meat was torn with the fingers and not cut into slices (an error in the depiction of Holy Thursday, where Jesus cuts slices of lamb for his apostles).

Scientific error No. 42: Some women are at the table with the men

52.5 (...) Jesus takes his place at the central table, with the husband and wife (...) Except for the mothers of the spouses and Mary, no women sit at this table. All the women are at the table along the wall, making a great noise (...) Jesus is near the master of the house and opposite Mary, who is next to the wife (...)

This is another sociological error about the customs of the time: the wife did not sit at her husband's table as is the case in modern weddings, and no

women were at the men's table. In the Jewish culture of the Second Temple, society was very much marked by laws of purity, modesty, and separation of men and women. Women and men ate separately even at wedding meals; this was common throughout the ancient Near East.

Theological Error No. 203 and Scientific Error No. 43: The Church forgot to translate "from now on" in verse 4

52.7 Jesus explains the meaning of the phrase to me. "This 'from now on,' which many translators omit, is the key to the phrase and explains its true meaning. (...) This 'now,' forgotten by many, meant this: 'You have been everything to me, O Mother, as long as I was the Jesus of Mary of Nazareth (...) Wait a little longer, and when my mission is accomplished, I will be yours again. (...) That is what this little 'now,' so full of meaning, means."

MV's assertion is a theological error because it amounts to attacking the Church's ability to faithfully transmit the text of the Gospels. This adverb does not appear in the Gospels, so "many translators" have not "omitted" it.

It is also a scientific error, since this adverb does not appear in any manuscript. Once again, we are faced with false science that MV claims to bring to his readers, when in fact it is nothing but lies refuted by the facts.

Theological Error No. 204: Does Mary want Jesus "all to herself"? Is Mary a possessive, self-centered mother?

52.7 Jesus explains the meaning of the sentence to me. "This 'from now on,' which many translators omit, is the key to the sentence and explains its true meaning. (...) This 'now,' forgotten by many, meant this: 'You have been everything to me, O Mother, as long as I was the Jesus of Mary of Nazareth (...) Wait a little longer, and when my mission is accomplished, I will be yours again. (...) That is what this little 'now,' so full of meaning, means.

This idea that Mary's deepest desire was to have Jesus "all to herself" is seriously offensive to her.

1) Mary is the servant of the Lord (cf. Lk 1:38):

From the Annunciation onwards, Mary defines herself by her total availability: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; let it be done to me according to your word." She is the very image of self-giving to God. To imagine that after the Redemption she would want "Jesus all to herself" is to betray the very essence of her inner life.

Mary was conceived without original sin and was preserved from its consequences. Now, original sin is rooted in self-centeredness, the desire to seize what belongs to God ("you will be like gods," Gen 3:5). A Mary who would desire "Jesus all for herself" would contradict her very nature as a sinless woman, perfectly oriented toward God.

2) The indissoluble unity of the two Hearts of Jesus and Mary in the salvific mission: Mary is not a rival to Jesus: the idea that Mary would wait for Jesus to "finish" and then "receive everything" is falsely competitive. In Catholic theology, Mary is not a rival to Christ, but cooperates in a unique way that is subordinate to his mission. Hence the title of co-redemptrix, never understood as equality with Jesus, but as a collaboration that is fully submissive and

loving collaboration.

In the logic of the cross: Jesus gives himself, Mary gives herself with him. She stands at the foot of the cross, not to gain any personal benefit, but to be given herself (cf. Jn 19:26-27: "Woman, here is your son"). It is the act of giving that introduces her as Mother of the Church.

3) In Heaven, Mary never ceases to intercede, to give herself, to love. Her reign with Christ is not one of possession but of service. She continues her maternal role: she does not receive "everything for herself," but distributes everything she receives.

Mary's heart is a heart of pure love, without any self-centeredness. The triumph of her Heart is a triumph of selfless love.

4) The idea that Mary would want "Jesus all to herself" is a human projection based on jealousy, envy, or power—all of which are incompatible with the perfect sanctification she lives. Marian holiness excludes any form of desire for domination or selfish appropriation.

Theological Error No. 205: "My hour has not yet come" is deleted

St. Augustine, echoed by St. Thomas Aquinas, explains that Jesus, by this phrase, is referring to his Passion because it is during his Passion that he will recognize Mary as his mother: "My hour has not yet come" means "I do not have the power to perform this miracle from you, who did not give me my divinity (you cannot be associated with it); but when the weakness of my human nature, which you gave me, is nailed to the Cross, then I will recognize you and associate you with my sacrifice."

This theme of "Jesus' hour" is important in the Gospel according to Saint John: "the hour of someone is the time when they accomplish the work for which they are particularly destined. The hour of the woman who is about to give birth

The hour of the mother is the hour of her childbirth (Jn 16:21). The hour of the unbelieving Jews is the time when God allows them the freedom to commit their crime (Jn 16:3-4). The hour of Jesus is the moment when the work for which he was sent into the world by the Father is definitively accomplished, namely, victory over Satan, sin, and death." André-Jean Festugière.

If it were Jesus speaking to Maria Valtorta, he would not have inspired her with an explanation that is scientifically false and theologically offensive to his mother, but would have given her the explanation provided by those geniuses of Catholicism, St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas.

The real Jesus knows that the verses of the Bible are to be interpreted with the Fathers of the Church: cf. 4th session of the Council of Trent, April 8, 1546: "The same holy council (...) orders that (...) no one (...) should have the audacity to twist the Holy Scriptures to his own private meaning, or to interpret them contrary to the explanation given by our mother the Holy Church, to whom it belongs to judge the true meaning of the Scriptures or [interpret it contrary] to the unanimous sentiment of the Fathers [of the Church], even if these interpretations were never to come to light. Offenders will be denounced by the Ordinaries and punished with the penalties of the law."

To this argument, a Valtortist responded by acknowledging that this part of verse 4 was missing but that it was "integrated" into MV's account. This response is false since MV's account completely dismantles the explanation given by the verse explained by
St. Augustine: MV explains that Mary expresses her impatience to have Jesus "all to herself," while the verse prophesies that Jesus will recognize his Mother at Golgotha. The two interpretations are irreconcilable.

Incredibility:

52.6 Mary (...) understands that something unpleasant is happening. "Son," she says softly, drawing Jesus' attention with these words, "Son, they have no more wine."

According to the seating plan "revealed" to MV (see Lorenzo Ferri's drawing based on MV's instructions): "Jesus is near the master of the house and opposite Mary, who is next to the bride. Mary would have said to Jesus, "Son, they have no more wine," while she was at the same table as Jesus and facing him. This means that these words, which were deeply humiliating for the bride and groom and their families (the shame of not being able to celebrate their wedding with dignity, because a wedding without wine is a failed wedding, an immense shame), would have been spoken in public and not discreetly in someone's ear.

It is impossible that Mary would have taken such a risk that the information about the lack of wine would have become known. She said these words, "They have no more wine," in his ear, or completely away from the guests and family, with the utmost discretion, and not face to face surrounded by family and guests.

Theological Error No. 206: Three copper jars instead of six stone jars

52.3 (...) On the ground, still to my left, were other amphorae and three large vessels shaped like copper jugs (more or less). To me, they looked like jars.

Note from the Maria Valtorta website: *"Three is corrected to six on a typed copy, but in handwriting that cannot be attributed with certainty to Maria Valtorta. The old edition mentioned six. The new edition [in French] sticks to three copper jars (...)".*

Valtortists say that she does not cross out her notebooks, but she does cross out the typewritten version, which amounts to crossing out her notebooks since she changes the text after her vision is complete because the text given by the vision was clearly wrong.

A vision that contradicts Holy Scripture thus demonstrates that it does not come from God. John[2:6] *Now there were six stone jars there for the Jews' ablutions, each holding two or three measures.* At the wedding in Cana, there were six stone jars, not three copper jars.

The stone jars recall the "rock from which God brought forth saving water" in the desert (Num. 20:11), "itself a foreshadowing of Christ who would give water and blood from his side (Jn. 19:34; 1 Cor. 10:4). Obviously, this symbol disappears when it is invented that the jars are made of copper.

Theological Error No. 207: It is not Jesus who tells the servants to serve the master of the feast, it is the steward who serves himself.

52.8 (...) I see the servants filling the jars with water brought from the well (...) I see the steward pouring some of the liquid for himself with a look of astonishment, tasting it again with an expression of even greater astonishment, and speaking to the master of the house and to the bridegroom, his neighbor (...)

John 2 [8]And he said to them, "Now draw some out and take it to the master of the banquet," and they did so.

Theological Error No. 207-208: verses 9 and 10 deleted

52.8 (...) I see the steward pouring himself a little of this liquid with a look of astonishment, tasting it again with an expression of even greater astonishment, and speaking to the master of the house and to the bridegroom, his neighbor (...)

9 As soon as the master of the banquet tasted the water that had been turned into wine, he did not know where the wine came from, but the servants who had drawn the water knew. They told the bridegroom,

10 "Everyone serves the good wine first, and after the guests have drunk freely, the inferior wine is served; but you have kept the good wine until now."

Theological Error No. 209: Jesus and his Mother are glorified in place of the bridegroom.

52.8 (...) A murmur passes through the room. Heads turn toward Jesus and Mary. People stand up to see better. They go toward the jars. There is silence, then a chorus of praise to Jesus. But He stands up and says only one word: "Thank Mary," and then He leaves the meal (...)

In the Gospel, Jesus performs the miracle secretly, and the miraculous wine brings glory to the groom, who is praised by the master of the banquet for having kept the good wine until the end, making it an exceptional wedding thanks to the generosity of the groom and the quality of his wine.

The EMV version is not possible because if Jesus had not kept this miracle secret, the shame of running out of wine would have fallen on the family and the groom.

In the Gospel, the master of the feast does not know where the wine comes from, he only praises its quality. The waiters are hired on an ad hoc basis to help out, they are not

would not risk ruining the reputation of the wedding by spreading the news that it had come within a hair's breadth of the immense shame of having no wine left to offer its guests. The fact that the wine ran out indicates the poverty of this family. The servants were only hired for the seven days that the wedding lasted.

John 2 [9] As soon as the master of the banquet tasted the water that had been turned into wine, he did not know where it had come from, but the servants who had drawn the water knew. They told the bridegroom, ([10]) "Everyone serves the good wine first, and after the guests have drunk freely, the inferior wine is served. But you have kept the good wine until now."

"They did not know where this wine came from," just as no one knows where the Spirit comes from or where it goes. Just like living water
"Where do you get this living water?" asks the Samaritan woman, just as Jesus says, "We don't know where he is" (Jn 9:29).

Theological Error No. 210: Valtorta omits John 2 [11] This was the first of the miracles that Jesus performed at Cana in Galilee, and he manifested his glory, and his disciples believed in him.

52.8 (...) A murmur passes through the room. Heads turn toward Jesus and Mary. People stand up to see better. They go toward the jars. There is silence, then a chorus of praise to Jesus.

Jesus has not yet performed any miracles, so it is not credible that those present would consider Jesus to be the author of the miracle. He only asked that six stone jars used for Jewish ablutions be filled with water. Then, we find ourselves with six jars filled with delicious wine. But only God can perform such a miracle. Jesus is not considered the Messiah in Nazareth or in Galilee, sa région d'origine, car il est trop dur

psychologically for those who have known him for 30 years to accept such a change in status. "They did not know where this wine came from" does not mean "the servants knew that it was Jesus who had performed or obtained this miracle."

Theological Error No. 211: Valtorta contradicts John 2:12

52.8 (...) But He rose and said a single word: "Thank Mary," and then He left the meal. At the threshold, He repeated: "Peace to this house and God's blessing upon you," and He added: "Mother, I greet you." The vision ended there.

In Valtorta, Jesus leaves the wedding without his mother. Whereas in the Gospel: **12** *After this, he went down to Capernaum with his mother, his brothers, and his disciples, and they stayed there only a few days.*

Weddings lasted seven days, so it is unthinkable that Jesus would spend only a few hours there and then leave. That would be very rude and ungrateful toward the family. It contradicts Eastern customs.

Theological Error No. 212: Mary's lips tremble when she cannot kiss Jesus

ch.52.4 (...) "Mary, go down to meet Jesus (...) The kiss trembles on Mary's lips, but she does not give it (...)".

Maria Valtorta, who was deprived of caresses and kisses all her life (since her mother thwarted three marriage plans), gives an important place to caresses and kisses in her visions.

The Virgin Mary is described as a woman

so sensual that when she cannot satisfy her desire to kiss Jesus, her lips tremble. This contradicts not only the fact that Mary was the opposite of someone seeking sensual gratification for herself, but it also contradicts Mary's perfect self-control, which she possessed because she had been preserved from the consequences of original sin. The Virgin Mary did not blush and she did not tremble.

Vulgarity No. 19-20: Mary and Jesus "order" the servants

*52.8 Mary **orders** the servants (Italian: Maria ordina ai servi): "Do whatever He tells you." (...)*
*And Jesus **commands** the servants: "Fill the jars with water." (Italian: **Maria ordina** ai servi: "Fate quello che Egli vi dirà." Maria ha letto negli occhi sorridenti del Figlio l'assenso, velato dal grande insegnamento a tutti i "vocati". E ai servi: «Empite d'acqua le idrie», **ordina Gesù [**121] E ai servi: «Empite d'acqua le idrie» ordina Gesù è un'aggiunta di MV su una copia dattiloscritta.)*

Write that Jesus and Mary "ask" would be more appropriate.

Theological Error No. 213: Leaving readers ignorant of important facts

This verse 4, "Woman, what do you want from me? My time has not yet come," has been the source of several heresies; yet the Jesus of MV does nothing to protect his readers from these heretical interpretations.

The Manicheans said that Jesus' body was not real but imaginary, since he seemed to be telling his mother that he had nothing in common with her.

Valentinus claimed that Christ had assumed a heavenly body, which owed nothing physically to the Virgin, as if Christ had told her that he had received nothing from her.

St. Augustine refutes them by saying: if you trust St. John when he reports that Jesus said to his Mother, "Woman, what have you to do with me?" (another possible translation of "What do you want of me?"), believe him also when he tells you, "The mother of Jesus was there," she is indeed the "mother" of Jesus.

The heresy of Ebion consisted in claiming that Christ was conceived from male seed, and that of Elvidius in asserting that the Virgin was no longer a virgin after giving birth. Both based their arguments on the word "woman," which they saw as proof of natural fertilization for one and of the loss of virginity for the other.

However, the Bible sometimes uses the word "woman" to refer to the female gender; as in Genesis 3:12, when Adam was still in the Garden of Eden and had not yet known his wife, he said to God, "The woman you gave me as a companion gave me fruit from the tree, and I ate it." Eve had remained a virgin until then. Here, therefore, the term "woman" does not imply sexual union or the loss of virginity.

The heresy of the Priscillianists claimed that everything happens according to destiny: the actions of men, even those of Christ, are subject to predetermined times; this is why Jesus referred to his hour, which had not yet come. But Christ himself is the creator of the stars, so he cannot be under their influence. The hour of the Passion was fixed by divine Providence and not by destiny or fate. Furthermore, our reason and will are immaterial realities, independent of matter; we, as spiritual beings, are capable of free choice.

Other meanings present in the Wedding at Cana:

Just as wine is drawn from the old wineskins of the Old Covenant, the Wedding at Cana heralds the marriage of our souls with God. Christ the Bridegroom invites us to the marriage of faith. Jesus came to the wedding at Cana to consecrate the wedding with his presence and to signify mystically that he himself came for a wedding [that of our soul with him].

The changing of water into wine symbolizes the Eucharistic wine, which becomes the blood of Christ through the sacrament and its miracle of Transubstantiation, the miracle of the change of substance of wine into the body, soul, and divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

St. Augustine, Treatise on the Gospel of John 9:2: by going to the wedding at Cana, Jesus reveals himself as the guarantor of marital chastity. Jesus sets us on the path to the nuptial mystery between himself and the Church, between himself and each of our souls. The bridegroom at the wedding at Cana is a figure of Our Lord: the good wine he has kept "until now" is his Gospel.

St. Cyril of Alexandria on John 2:5-6: Jesus acquiesces to his mother's desire: this is a magnificent demonstration of the honor due to parents.

Isaac of the Star, Sermon: There are three different kinds of marriage: that of flesh with flesh, that of flesh with spirit, and that of spirit with God. The first marriage makes two flesh into one flesh (Mt 19:6). The second marriage unites the rational soul and the body that opposes it, making them one person. The third marriage makes one spirit one with God: 1 Cor 6:**17** *whoever is united with the Lord is one spirit with him.* John 17:**21** **[***I pray]*

that they may all be one, as you, Father, are in me and I in you, that they also may be in us. "Through the first marriage, man begins to exist; in the second, he is formed; in the third, he is consummated." It is to be one with God that we exist and subsist.

(These passages are taken from St. Thomas Aquinas' Commentary on St. John and from *The Christian Bible*, The Four Gospels, §29 The Wedding at Cana, Anne Sigier editions.)

Conclusion on the Wedding at Cana according to Maria Valtorta

The episode of the Wedding at Cana is proof that *the Gospel as revealed to me* by Maria Valtorta is not an authentic apparition, because MV's vision contradicts the Gospel and invents an apocryphal gospel. The Wedding at Cana symbolically announces the wedding of Jesus with the souls of his chosen ones. This wedding announces the delicious wine of the New Covenant, replacing the ordinary water of Jewish ritual ablutions. When Mary asks for wine, Jesus responds with a smile and love, as if she had asked him for the new wine of the New Covenant; Jesus evokes the blood of his future sacrifice and announces to her the unique place she will have as mother of all the faithful when he recognizes her at the foot of the cross ("Woman, behold your son (...) son, behold your mother" Jn 19:26-27).

All of this is completely distorted, truncated, embellished, and set aside by MV. We are left with an episode that is grotesque in its anachronisms regarding the customs of the time. MV is not even capable of offering his readers the explanations found in the commentaries of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. The reader is deceived, led astray under the guise of false science: this history of the adverb "now" which

would explain everything when it explains nothing and does not exist in any manuscript. The ignorant soul is left amazed when it has just been thoroughly duped.

***

Indecency No. 152: God gives Maria Valtorta a vision of a young woman completely naked

The "Beauty of Chorozaïn" or Chorazeïn
94.5 – "Go to the lake and wash yourself" (...) The woman (...) goes down into the lake (...) her clothes (...) cover her very little (...) "Woman: come out and come here. Take the cloth that is on the branch" (...) The woman obeys and comes out, completely naked (...) The first to cry out is Peter, who looks at her, while Andrew, more reserved, turns his back on her. But hearing his brother, he turns around and cries out in turn (...)
The woman (...) curls up, ashamed of her nakedness (...) February 1, 1945. T2ch. 59. T2ch. 94.

Since when does God the Holy Spirit offer visions of total and frontal nudity to mystics? Isn't it rather human lust that invents such things, or the devil who gives such visions? To make it clear that a leper has been miraculously cured of leprosy, it is not necessary for the mystic to receive a vision of her total and frontal nudity.

Indecency No. 153: God gives Maria Valtorta a vision of a young man completely naked.

128.2 "Man, take off the tunic from your chest (...) The young man takes off his garment, appearing naked before everyone. He has only the smooth, unblemished skin of a healthy young man. "Look, mother," said Jesus (...) March 12, 1945. T2ch. 95. T2ch. 128.

Since when does God the Holy Spirit offer visions of total and frontal nudity to his mystics? Isn't it rather lust that invents such things, or the devil who gives such visions? To make it clear that a leper has been miraculously cured of leprosy, there is no need for the mystic to receive a vision of his total and frontal nudity.

In French, we say colloquially "se rincer l'œil" (to wash one's eyes). This kind of lewdness proves that this vision did not come from God. Let us remember that this apparition is supposed to have been given in the 1940s, well before the sexual revolution. Women were not used to seeing advertisements and TV shows showing nudity.

Conclusion

A mediumistic feat and a theological shipwreck?

Did Maria Valtorta, through her writings, achieve a mediumistic feat and a theological shipwreck? Why do her writings stray so far from the Gospels? Why do they contradict on several points the explanations given to the Gospels by the Magisterium, the Fathers, and the Doctors of the Church? As the theologians consulted by the Holy Office say, Valtorta proposes another gospel, an apocryphal, false, and misleading gospel.

The sheer bulk of the 5,000 pages of *The Gospel as Revealed to Me* discourages readers from seeking the commentaries of the Fathers, the great mystics, the great spiritual authors, and the great exegetes. By way of comparison, the Bible, in the same format, has 1,110 pages, and the Gospels have 89 pages.

When I called the French representative of the Italian Maria Valtorta Foundation, he explained to me that in order to understand her writings, I would first have to read her entire work, which is 8,468 pages long. So, to find out whether Jesus kissed men on the mouth by surprise or whether the Jews pronounced the name of God, one would have to read 8,500 pages. Such advice, frequently given by Valtortists, is a fruit of the stupidity of this false apparition and a ruse to delegitimize any rational criticism.

Deceived by her gift of clairvoyance and/or by the devil?

It is certain that her visions are not inspired by God, since they contradict the Gospel and the Catholic faith on many important points, as we have demonstrated in this book. But what happened? Where did she get all this information? Are these visions diabolical? Are they mediumistic visions linked to unknown human psychic powers? Experts on this subject are not unanimous. We do not take a position on this question.

Valtorta ended her life in complete mental isolation.

It was probably because she realized that she had been deceived by her own mind that she lived in total mental confinement for the last five years of her life: "a kind of mental isolation," say her admirers, from 1956 to 1961.

In 1950, she sensed her total and definitive condemnation.

She believed she was contributing a major work, but she realized that this was not the case. In a letter dated July 24, 1950, to Bishop Carinci, she expressed her suspicion that what she had been told about the Holy See's judgment on her writings did not hold water: "If it is already known that the Supreme Pontiff says 'yes,'
' but then orders 'no', or if it is known that in reality it is not He who reigns, but the Holy Office or the Secretariat of State, and that the Holy Father does not have the strength to impose himself, let us say so openly. But let us stop acting in this way, letting people hope for an imminent resolution and then repeating: "we are back to square one." This alternative has existed for three years. Did the Servite Fathers of Mary and the prelates of the Holy See, who knew the gravity of the condemnations against her writings, fear to tell her the truth for fear that she would go mad or commit suicide? (The Servites knew the text of the judgment

since, according to his own words, Father Berti countersigned the condemnation). We do not know why, starting in 1956, she shut herself away in total psychological isolation. It seems likely to us that she received information that her visions were riddled with doctrinal errors and things incompatible with the decency and respect due to the Virgin Mary. Our Valtortist friends explain that she offered the sacrifice of her intelligence to God, but it is not a favorable sign for the supernatural character of apparitions that the visionary should end up in madness or debility. We are not saying that Maria Valtorta ended up insane, but we are saying that it seems contrary to the history of Catholic mysticism to assert that the Church would take it as a favorable sign that a visionary should end her life in this way. Such a downfall is, on the other hand, quite common in diabolical mysticism. Allan Kardec, the founder of spiritism (whose spiritual father was a defender of Valtorta), writes that some people sink into schizophrenia from their very first session with the spirits of the dead.

Jesus preaching to all, from the beginning, that he is Christ and God

It is wrong to write, as Maria Valtorta does, that Jesus taught his divinity and messiahship to a large number of people from the beginning of his public life. This is one of the structural errors of "The Gospel as Revealed to Me."

The fable of the evil Holy Office and the kind Pius XII

How do Valtortists explain to their audience that the work has not been condemned? They invented a fable about the evil Monsignor Giovanni Pepe, all-powerful in the Holy Office, who managed to forbid all the bishops on the planet from giving an imprimatur, that is, official approval, to EMV. Meanwhile, the kind Pius XII

had the leisure to read 5,000 pages of MV and would have taken sides in favor of its publication. But the evil Holy Office, behind his back, would succeed in thwarting the papal will. This novel, worthy of children's stories, is professed only by people who cannot admit that they areare promoting an apparition and and blasphemous.

First of all, it is not Bishop Pepe who heads the Holy Office. We provide the names of the 14 theologians who condemned EMV. Then the heads of the Holy Office, cardinals and bishops, themselves condemned EMV, and finally, Pope Pius XII condemned it while asking for discretion: that the condemnation not be published.

Next, Pius XII's confessor condemns EMV in a 12-page document, explaining its serious doctrinal errors and its geographical, historical, and other errors. The so-called vocal imprimatur was given in an audience in February 1948, and the exegete Vaccari condemned EMV in 1949. Finally, Pius XII's confessor, Father Agostino Béa, condemned the work in a 12-page document on January 17, 1952. This was the pope's confessor: so how long will the Valtortists continue to believe that Pius XII was favorable when his confessor pointed out all these heresies and insanities? Such a version has no chance of being true. Father Bea was rector of *the* prestigious *Biblical Institute* in Rome; he was not some obscure clerk of the Holy See who barely knew his catechism.

The Valtortists discover that the file is available for consultation.

How is it that these people who claim to be "specialists" or "scientists" were unable to find out whether MV's file was secret or accessible?

Compare Valtorta and St. Thomas for each verse

If others wish to work on Maria Valtorta, we suggest that they compare each verse of the Gospel according to St. John with what Valtorta writes on the one hand, and the commentaries of the Golden Chain and St. Thomas Aquinas on the other. It seems to us that too often she merely repeats without offering any interesting insights. In the worst cases, as with the Wedding at Cana, she distorts the inspired verses and invents a version that is incompatible with the Gospel.

Ideally, this comparison should be done for each verse of the four Gospels: on one side, what Valtorta writes, and on the other, what St. Thomas Aquinas and the Fathers of the Church say: http://jesusmarie.com/verset.html

The Virgin Mary quasi-deified and dragged lower than the earth

In Maria Valtorta's "The Gospel as Revealed to Me," we find two paradoxically opposed ways of denigrating and offending the Virgin Mary: first, a whole series of expressions (ranging from ambiguity to pure heresy) that tend to quasi-deify Mary. The Catholic, liturgical, and theological ways of glorifying the Mother of the Savior are not taken up by Valtorta. She does not help the faithful to appropriate all that the Catholic Church has expressed to magnify the Virgin Mary. Valtorta falls into the grotesque or heretical by trying too hard. The pedestal erected by Maria Valtorta becomes a farce because it is so excessive.

There is also a movement in the opposite direction, where Mary is accused of having sinned, of having rebelled against the sufferings of Jesus. Mary is described as losing control of herself, offering the distressing spectacle of a confused woman who says and does anything under the weight of suffering.

As part of the blasphemous accusation of losing control of herself, Maria Valtorta imbues the Mother of Jesus with a serious sensual addiction: she is portrayed as a woman excessively attached to kissing and caressing her son and being kissed and caressed by him. At the wedding at Cana, when she stops herself from kissing Jesus, her lips tremble so much that her body craves his kiss ("The kiss trembles on Mary's lips, but she does not give it" January 16, 1944). In the Holy Sepulchre, this is one of her main activities towards the body of Jesus, and during the first appearance of the risen Jesus, she engages in a marathon of kisses all over his body, even kissing Jesus on the mouth (and here the Valtortists respond: "What's the problem, since she's not using her tongue...?").

Knowing, loving, and serving God

Teaching the ignorant is one of the seven spiritual works of mercy. We hope, in our humble way, to serve the Catholic Church by trying to make its faith, morals, and mysteries better known. It is a way of serving God.

We are publishing this book to please the Virgin Mary and defend her honor.

Appendices

Letter from Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger dated January 31, 1985

SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH
Prot. N. 144/85 – Rome, January 31, 1985

Most Reverend Eminence,

In a letter dated May 18, Rev. Father Umberto Losacco, Capuchin, requested clarification from this Sacred Congregation regarding the writings of Maria Valtorta, collected under the title The Poem of the Man-God, and whether there was a judgment by the Magisterium of the Church on the publication in question, with the corresponding bibliographical reference.

I have the honor of informing Your Eminence, who will assess the appropriateness of informing the Reverend Father Losacco, that the work in question was indeed placed on the Index on December 16, 1959, and defined by *L'Osservatore Romano* on January 6, 1960, as "a poorly fictionalized life of Jesus." The provisions of the Decree were republished with an explanatory note in *L'Osservatore Romano* on December 1, 1961, as you can see in the attached documentation.

Some people subsequently considered it lawful to print and distribute the work in question, after the Index had been repealed, and again in *L'Osservatore Romano* (June 15, 1966), it was stated, as published in the *Apostolic Acts of the Holy See* (1966), that although abolished, the Index retained all its moral value, indicating therefore that it was not appropriate to distribute and recommend a

work whose condemnation was not taken lightly, but was based on careful consideration in order to neutralize the damage that such publication could cause to the faith of the most disadvantaged.

I am grateful for any action Your Eminence may take in this matter, and I take this opportunity to reaffirm my highest regards.

Yours sincerely
Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (with

attached document(s))

To His Eminence Rev.ma Card.
Giuseppe SIRI Archbishop of
Genoa Joseph Cardinal
Ratzinger

Response of the Valtortists to Ratzinger's condemnation

Mrs. Geneviève Esquier claims to have seen a letter from Cardinal Ratzinger in favor of Valtorta. Was a false letter written by an accomplice and sent to Marcel Clément to deceive him? In any case, Marcel Clément, editor of the newspaper *L'Homme Nouveau*, did not publish the letter. No one saw it except Mrs. Esquier? Why wasn't the letter sent to the Maria Valtorta Association and to her Italian and French publishers? The existence of such a letter is not credible because it would have been enough for Ratzinger to find a single bishop to give the imprimatur to the work, which he did not do. It would have been very simple to do: a word to his private secretary to find a bishop among the 5,000 bishops on the planet and it would have been settled. He did nothing, which proves that this story about the letter is a lie. All he had to do was

a new examination by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, conclude that it was a sad misunderstanding, and affirm the orthodoxy of Valtorta's writings. None of this happened. And now that some important documents from the Holy See's official file on *The Gospel as Revealed to Me* have been published, everyone can see the serious doctrinal, scientific, and moral errors that contradict the idea that these visions came from God.

1961, Articles in *La Civilta Cattolica*

In 1961, the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* published several articles in the Italian Jesuit magazine *La Civilta cattolica*, in which EMV was condemned as *a monument of puerility, imagination, and historical and exegetical errors diluted in a subtly sensual atmosphere by the presence of a swarm of women following Jesus. See laciviltacattolica.it, Issue 2665 of July 1, 1961.*

These articles are not signed (they have no author's name) but instead of a signature there are "three asterisks," which is a typographical code indicating that the articles originate from *the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* itself (the same code was used in the past in *L'Osservatore Romano*).

Here is an excerpt that has become famous because it was quoted by Monsignor Josef Clemens, private secretary to Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger when he was Prefect of *the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith,* in his letter of September 9, 1988, to Mrs. C. X. of Calgary, Alberta, Canada:

“The ‘phenomenon’ has already been scientifically re-evaluated and placed in a well-known category of mental illness, and the additions to the second edition do not change the nature of the Work, which remains a monument of puerile ex , of imagination , and of errors , historical , and

exegetical errors diluted in a subtly sensual atmosphere by the presence of a swarm of women following Jesus.

Letter from Cardinal Ratzinger's secretary dated Sept. 9, 1988

Joseph Cardinal RATZINGER
Secretariat

September 9, 1988
Vatican City

Dear Madam

His Eminence has asked me to respond to your letter of May 20, which arrived here only on July 7.

It is true that Maria Valtorta's "Poem of the Man-God" was placed on the Index in 1959 and described by *L'Osservatore Romano* on January 6, 1960, as a highly fictionalized version of the life of Jesus.

The Index has since been abolished, but the reasons for the original censorship remain valid; this work is a collection of childish fantasies, historical and exegetical errors, all presented in a subtly sensual context.

Sincerely, Rev.
Josef Clemens
Private Secretary

Mrs. C.
Calgary,
Alberta,
Canada

Table of Contents

Book outline....3
Preface....5
4 Millions of copies sold, translations into 30 languages....5
Pleasing God - Constructive criticism....5
There is nothing derogatory about saying "Valtorta" or talking about "Valtortists."....6
The providential help of three members of the clergy and the indecencies written against Jesus and Mary (particularly in the visionsGood Friday) led me to write this book.....6
The *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* declared again in 2025 that .these writings are not of supernatural origin....7
A letter in 2024 from Pope Francis confirms the purely origin human, literary of *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*.....8
Quoting to prove reading....9
Sign of falsity: Jesus threatens with hell or centuries in purgatory.anyone who criticizes Maria Valtorta's writings....10
The success of Valtorta's writings can be explained in part by the false endorsements of popes and saints....12
Another explanation for this success lies in the contempt of bishops and theologians for the supernatural and apparitions.....13
I continue to love certain things about Valtorta....13
The Roman file on Maria Valtorta is no longer classified as secret.....15
Publication of the Italian originals....15
Is publication without imprimatur the only problem?....16
The solution is to produce a critical edition explaining the errors and indecencies.....16
On the sufferings of Jesus and Mary during the Passion: have translated.Saint Baptiste Varani....17
On the subject of the sufferings of Jesus and Mary, we recommend reading 17
Perform a Textual Data Analysis....18
Does prove divine inspiration? 19
writing without erasures and providing geographical and historical details
Are Maria Valtorta's visions and dictations diabolical?....19
Why didn't "Jesus" warn Valtorta that she must obey the Holy Office and that her spiritual father had chosen to disobey?....21
Does "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" cause conversions at ?....22
Does "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" discourage its readers from reading the Gospels?....23
A French priest who teaches exegesis and theology has criticized *The Gospel as Revealed to Me*....23
Does *The Gospel as Revealed to Me* make those who believe in it

without reservation?....24
Scientific knowledge of the visions is not a criterion of authenticity....26
False appearances can bear good fruit....27
In the event of contradictions with the Bible, doctrinal errors, or indecency, a vision cannot possibly come from God....27
Does Maria Valtorta, through her writings, cause people to commit mortal sins of rash judgment?....27
The effects of EMV on Valtortists....29
The Nine Notes of the True Private Revelations....31
The Rules for Discerning True Revelations from False Ones....33
PART ONE....49
BRIEF NOTE [Mgr Giovanni Pepe]....49
Summary of the Brief Note....57
[February 14, 1949: Theologians - Consultors of the Holy Office]....61
[February 16, 1949: Cardinals and bishops of the Holy Office]....63
[February 17, 1949: approval [of the condemnation] by Pope Pius XII]....63
Opinion of Father Alberto Vaccari, S.J.....65
Summary of the opinion of Father Alberto Vaccari....75
Opinion of Reverend Father Agostino Béa, S.J.....83
Summary of the opinion of Father Agostino Béa....101
SECOND PART....107
213 Theological errors, 153 Indecent expressions, 43 Scientific errors, 20 Vulgarities, 7 Anti-Semitism....107
Theological Error #1: Mary Magdalene did not touch Jesus, and if she had touched him (after his resurrection), she would have contaminated him. 107
Theological Error No. 2: "Mary can be called the 'younger daughter' of the Father." ("Youngest" means to be born after a brother or sister.)....111
Theological Error No. 3: The soul created to be that of the Mother of God was "from God."....112
Theological Error No. 4: The soul created to be that of the Mother of God was "breathed by God."....112
Theological Error No. 5: Jesus "believes" that it was after he resisted Satan's temptations in the desert that "the power of came upon him.miracles" ..112
Theological Error No. 6: "I had been God. I had become Man. Now, triumphant over the animal joined to human nature, I was Man-God." 113
Theological Error No. 7: "It is time for the Word to come to earth." "In Heaven, the Two who remained contemplated the works of the Word." 113
Theological Error No. 8: "My Mother loved from the first moment of her conception." 114
Theological Error No. 9: Mary, "a body forming around a soul" 115
Theological Error No. 10: You have applied Proverbs 8:22-35 to Wisdom, but they speak of Her. 115
Theological Error #11: *Jesus said, "To be flesh, I needed a mother."* 116
Theological Error #12: "To be God, I needed a father who was God."....116

The Equality of the Persons of the Holy Trinity.....118
Theological Error No. 13: Transposing onto Mary the role of prototype for creation normally attributed to the Word.....119
Theological Error No. 14: Attributing to the Virgin Mary the words of God the Father at the baptism of Jesus and at the Transfiguration 120
Indecency No. 1: God makes strawberries while looking at the Virgin mouthMary's 120
Indecency No. 2: Jesus is sadistic: he enjoys scaring St. Peter by publicly accusing him, in a serious tone, of being an "usurper" and a "corrupter." St. Peter: "You really scared me." 121
Theological Error No. 13 (continued): Transposing onto Mary the role of prototype for creation attributed to the Word 122
Theological Error #15: Jesus is the center of the Trinity.....123
Theological Error #16: Procreation is the sole purpose of marriage 123
Theological Error No. 17: Original sin was the marital act.....125
Theological Error No. 18: Unwanted celibacy is "worth less than nothing." 126
Theological Error No. 19: Mary is merged with the wisdom of God and contains infinite intelligence.....127
Theological Error No. 20: The Incarnation is confinement without diminution. 127
Theological Error No. 21: Mary possessed Wisdom "before she was born."....128
Theological Error No. 22: Mary's pre-existence: her heart was beating in Paradise before her birth 128
Indecency No. 3: At the age of twelve, Mary speaks of the "prick of the senses" of her future husband.....128
Theological Error No. 23: When the angels carry bodyMary's, they make more noise with their wings than they did a minute earlier when they were not carrying the Virgin Mary 12
Remark No. 1: Mediocre style, everything is "small" in the descriptions....129
Theological Error No. 24 and Indecency No. 4: The Virgin Mary pronounces the Holy Name of God.....130
Theological Error No. 25: "Mary remembered God (.....) everything that her mind had seen in the splendor of God's Heaven at the moment she was created."....130
Theological Error No. 26: "The saints remember God and the words heard in the Creative Thought."....131
Theological Error No. 27: Mary remembered hearing the words of eternal Science when she was begotten with her immortal spirit by God. 131
Theological Error No. 29: The Virgin Mary blushed. 132
Theological Error No. 30 and Indecency No. 5: Jesus was "born" by "a divine seed deposited in" the womb of the Virgin Mary.....133
Theological Error No. 31: The perpetual chastity of Saint Joseph repairs the original sin, which was sexual. 134

Theological Error No. 17 (continued) 134
Indecency No. 6: The Virgin Mary caresses her mother in her womb 134
Theological Error No. 32: Cain and his children were zoophiles.....135
Scientific Error No. 1: The monsters born of the couplings zoophilic of Cain and his children "astonish your scholars and them lead astray." 135
Theological Error No. 33: Mary carried Maria Valtorta with her in the secrecy of her early years.....13
10 Errors of Maria Valtorta on the Annunciation.....137
Theological Error No. 34 and Indecency No. 7: The Virgin Mary committed the sin of pronouncing the name of God 138
Theological Error No. 35: St. Gabriel repeats "Hail" twice.....139
Theological Error No. 36: St. Gabriel repeats "do not be afraid" three times to the Virgin Mary 140
Theological Error No. 37: St. Gabriel says to the Virgin: understand what kind of Son you are going to give birth to 140
Theological Error No. 38: The Virgin Mary considered the possibility of renouncing her vow of virginity 140
Theological Error No. 39: St. Gabriel: "[God] will watch over your interests if you trust him." 141
Theological Error No. 40: St. Gabriel pressures the Virgin Mary: "The world, heaven, and the Eternal One await your answer!" 141
Theological Error No. 41: "Let it be done to me according to HIS word" (Valtorta) or "Let it be done to me according to YOUR word" (Luke 1:38)..141
Theological Error No. 42: St. Gabriel addresses the Virgin Mary, his Queen, informally. 142
Theological Error No. 43: St. Gabriel ends this conversation with an act of adoration before the Virgin Mary. 142
Theological Error No. 44: Jesus invents a philosophical doctrine opposed to Christianity that does not exist: "classicism." 143
Note No. 2: Jesus probably confuses naturalism with naturism. 143
Theological Error #45: Without original sin, human procreation would have occurred without the sexual act between a man and a woman 145
Theological Error No. 46: The sequence of events of original sin according to Valtorta: Satan caresses Eve's limbs. Satan arouses in her a feeling she had not felt before. She "lives." She wanted to try it. It was the awakening of the flesh. She ate the fruit.....146
Theological Error No. 47: Maria Valtorta mutilates the verse from Genesis (3:6) to change its meaning 146
Valtorta: *The woman saw that the tree was good for food and pleasing to "the eye... She took some of its fruit and ate it."* 146
Theological Error No. 17 (continued): The original sin was the conjugal act. 146
Theological Error No. 48: Maria Valtorta writes that Satan provoked in Eve,

before she sinned, an excitement that she did not have, but this is not possible because Eve was perfect and therefore had perfect control over all her emotions and sensations. 146
Theological Error No. 49: The Incarnation consisted in the deposit of the "Seed of the Lord" in Mary....149
Theological Error No. 50: The blood of the Virgin Mary served as fertilizer "for the Seed of the Lord" 149
Theological Error No. 51: Eve "wanted to lower herself to the level of a lower creature" 150
Theological Error No. 52: Satan's temptation in the Garden of Eden was: "Do you not know the joy of being two in one flesh, which creates a third and so on?" 150
Theological Error No. 17 (continued): The original sin was the conjugal act. 150
Indecency No. 8: "Eve rolled in the mud and filth."....152
Theological Error #53: Mary tells Elizabeth that Jesus is God. 152
Theological Error #54: Satan believes that God can sin because during Jesus' temptation in the desert, Satan says, "I remember that you are my God."153
Indecency No. 9: Mary tells St. Joseph that her humility is perfect. 157
Theological Error #55: Mary says that she "deserved to conceive the One who was expected." 157
Theological Error No. 56: Mary claims that she "conceived" Jesus. 157
Theological Error No. 57: "Speak, Joseph, what do you want?" "Your forgiveness." 157
Theological Error No. 17 (continued): One of the branches of Eve's sin is .lust 159
Theological Error No. 58 (+ No. 17) and Indecency No. 10: Eve's lust: "It was not enough for her to satisfy herself alone."....159
Theological Error No. 59 and Anti-Semitism No. 1: Jesus says that the will of the Jewish people "is not good." 160
Theological Error No. 60: Jesus asked the holy women of Jerusalem, "Pray for me." 160
Theological Error No. 61: Valtorta distorts the Gospel by omitting verses 30 and 31....161
Theological Error No. 62: Valtorta changes the meaning of this passage because, according to her, Jesus warned the women alive during the Passion of future trials that would befall them, whereas the verses of the Gospels are a prophecy of the sufferings that would be endured during the siege of Jerusalem and its destruction by the Romans in the year 70.....161
Theological Error No. 63: Valtorta omits the darkness mentioned in the Gospels. Matthew 27:45"From the sixth hour until the ninth hour, darkness came over the whole land." 162
Theological Error No. 64: Jesus does not know the day of the end of the world.....162
Theological Error No. 65: The Catholic Church has misinterpreted the words

of Jesus Christ. 165
Theological Error No. 66: The Church "believes itself to be superior to everything and
all." 165
Theological Error No. 67 and Anti-Semitism No. 2: The foolish pride of the chosen people. 170
Theological Error No. 68 and Anti-Semitism No. 3: The Jewish people wanted the error that led to their extermination. 170
Theological Error No. 69, Scientific Error No. 2, Anti-Semitism No. 4: God the Father is unaware: 1) that the State of Israel was founded 2) that the Jewish people can once again gather there 3) that this puts an end to their dispersion.
.....170
Theological Error No. 70 and Anti-Semitism No. 5: The Jewish people wanted to commit the error of not believing in Jesus, and they are collectively responsible for this error. 170
Theological Error No. 71: The infallibility of the Church is conditional on its holiness. 172
Theological Error No. 72 and Indecency No. 11: Pope Pius XII will be damned if he does not recognize the apparitions of Maria Valtorta. 172
Theological Error No. 73: God's extraordinary gift to the pontificate of Pius XII is not the victory over Nazism or the promulgation of the dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, but "the Gospel as it was to merevealed."
.....172
Theological Error No. 74: We deserved Jesus' sacrifice 176
Theological Error #75: Jesus told everyone that he was the Christ.
.....176
Indecency No. 12: Valtorta shows disrespect toward Jesus by writing: "as if he were already experiencing a slight delirium." 178
Theological Error No. 76 and Indecency No. 13: As he dies, Jesus thinks more of his mother than of his heavenly Father. 17

Theological Error No. 77: The shepherds from the Nativity are present on the Way of the Cross and at Golgotha. 179
Theological Error No. 78: The Gospel speaks of darkness, Maria Valtorta sees a "strange," "frightening" light 18
Theological Error No. 79: Joseph of Arimathea was present at Golgotha before Jesus' death, whereas the Gospel says that he came there after his death.
.....180
Theological Error No. 80: Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea give money to the soldiers so they can come to Golgotha. 180
Theological Error No. 81: Valtorta contradicts herself on the stigmatization of the Virgin 181
Theological Error No. 82: Jesus does not control the hour of his death; heis struck with a stone, which brings him out of his agony 181
Theological Error No. 83: Jesus is stoned while crucified 181

Theological Error No. 84: Valtorta contradicts Matthew 27:48.....182
Indecency No. 14: Jesus on the cross "*He looks like a hungry child seeking his mother's breast."*.....183
Blasphemy and Insults Against the Virgin Mary.....185
Indecency No. 15 Mary: *I cannot even give Him a drop of my tears.* 186
Indecency No. 16 Mary: *My breast, why do you no longer give milk?* 186
Theological Error No. 85 and Indecency No. 17: Mary: *God, why, why are you abandoning us like this?*.....186
Theological Error No. 86 and Indecency No. 18: Mary: *A miracle for my Son!* 186
Theological Error No. 87 and Indecency No. 19: Mary: *Shall I quench his thirst with my blood, since I have no milk?*.....186
Indecency No. 20: *Like a child complaining, Jesus calls out, "Mummy!"*.....187
Indecency No. 21: Ridiculing Mary "Yes, my Treasure, I am here.".....187
Indecency No. 22: Ridiculing and infantilizing Jesus: "Mommy, where are you? I can't see you anymore. Are you abandoning me too?".....187
Indecency No. 23: Ridiculing Mary: "Mommy is here, she's here."187
Indecency No. 24: Belittling Jesus: "His imminent death makes him speak as if he were delirious and does not even know what he is saying."188
Indecency No. 25: *Belittling Jesus: [He] does not understand*.....188
Indecency No. 26: Belittling Jesus: His last thought is not for his heavenly Father but for his mother.....188
Indecency No. 27: Mary with her "mouth open" and "eyes wide open" 188
Indecency No. 28: Mary "cries," "wavers," and almost falls.....189
Theological Error No. 88: Valtorta contradicts Matthew 27:52-53 regarding the saints who rose after Jesus' resurrection 190
Theological Error No. 89: Valtorta contradicts the *Acts of the Apostles* on Gamaliel.....190

Scientific error No. 40: Mary "separates her hair in disorder, it puts back in order," whereas the Holy Shroud proves that Jesus had his hair tied back in a short braid that hung down his neck. 192
Indecency No. 29: Hysterical reaction of the Virgin Mary: Mary is said to have screamed and fainted upon seeing the heart of Jesus: *"she sees (* .....*) the heart*
*of her Son. She cries out, then (...) She cries out (...) and appears dead (…)*192
Indecency No. 30: Belittling the Virgin Mary: "she cries out" 193
Indecency No. 31: Ridiculing Mary: "Mary never tires of caressing these icy limbs of his body," *she* kisses *his fingers*, the wound in his side, she moans and cries out.....193
Indecency No. 32: Portraying Mary as a madwoman rocking Jesus as if at his birth.....194
Theological Error No. 90: *"this God who is in Me to work the miracle of Redemption."* 195
Indecency No. 33: Belittling Mary, making her appear to be a kind of madwoman, uttering words incompatible with the extreme pain she was

experiencing 196
Indecency No. 34: Mary speaks to the corpse as if she did not know that Jesus' soul could hear her without addressing the corpse. 196
Theological Error No. 91 and Indecency No. 35: Mary complains, even though the true Virgin Mary knew exactly the importance and role of these sufferings and of this horrible Passion, and she adhered with all her soul to the will of God and therefore to what had happened. 196
Indecency No. 36: Mary tells the corpse that she will heal his wounded hand if Jesus gives it to her. 196
Indecency No. 37: Mary tells the corpse that she will not hurt him: he is a corpse, so he can no longer feel pain. 196
Indecency No. 38: Mary tells the corpse that she will warm its hand wounded with her kisses, her tears, her breath, and her love. 197
Indecency No. 39: Mary asks the corpse of Jesus to give her "a caress." 197
Indecency No. 40: Mary evokes the importance of Jesus' caresses in her life. 197
Indecency No. 41: Marie complains: "Inhuman torment!" 197
Theological Error No. 92 and Indecency No. 42: Mary says that the wicked "took my Son's soul," when no one took his life; he alone decided on his death. 198
Indecency No. 43: Mary insults: "cruel hyenas united with Satan." 198
Indecency No. 44: Mary calls out and addresses people who are not present; she speaks into the void; she speaks to herself. 198
Indecency No. 45: Mary does not understand prophecies and words Jesus' concerning his crucifixion, since she regrets not having been crucified with him 198
Indecency No. 46: Mary accuses the Jews of not hesitating to "kill God made flesh." 199
Indecency No. 47: Mary asserts that not killing him with her son constitutes a second crime. 199
Indecency No. 48: Mary speaks harshly to Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, and Saint John. 199
Indecency No. 49: Mary asks to be locked in the three daystomb for 200
Indecency No. 50: Mary asks questions of the corpse 200
Indecency No. 51: Mary orders Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, and Saint John to leave the tomb and leave her there for three days without or water.food 200
Indecency No. 52: Mary, in her son's tomb, evokes the "sweet trembling (...) that moves a virgin when (...) she hears the footsteps of her husband coming for the wedding." 201
Theological Error No. 93 and Indecency No. 53: The Father and the Holy Spirit created the "seed" from which Jesus came. 201
Theological Error No. 94 and Indecency No. 54: Jesus came from a miraculous "seed." 201
Theological Error No. 95 and Indecency No. 55: Mary speaks of

"seed" 201
Theological Error No. 96: Concentrated divine perfume made Mary pregnant 203
Indecency No. 56: Mary speaks of "bastard" 203
Theological Error No. 97: Mary claims to be the author of the miracle of the Incarnation. 203
Indecency No. 57: Mary cries out in anguish at the tomb. 204
Indecency No. 58: Mary wants to warm and rock the corpse of Jesus.
Indecency No. 59: Mary says, "If I can warm him, he will rise sooner." 204
Indecency No. 60: Valtorta insults the Virgin Mary: "The Sorrowful One is almost delirious." 204
Theological Error No. 98 and Indecency No. 61: Mary refuses to allow the body to be washed. 206
Indecency No. 62: Mary, ungrateful, overwhelms Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea 206
Indecency No. 63: Mary speaks to Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathearudely 207
Theological Error No. 99 and Indecency No. 64: Burying Jesus with spit and dirt is a sign of faith in his resurrection. 207
Theological Error No. 100 and Indecency No. 65: Mary wants to violate religious customs and place Jesus in the tomb in filth. 207
Theological Error No. 101 and Indecency No. 66: Jesus *just a is "tired man resting."* 207
Indecency No. 67: "For his mother, he is just a tired child who is sleeping." 208
Theological Error No. 102: "I, whom Motherhood makes a priestess ritual priestess" 208
Indecency No. 68: Jesus will rise more easily if we do not put on himthe funeral bandages 209
Indecency No. 69: Mary makes two insulting remarks to Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea: "Has this day made you stupid? Have you lost your memory?" 209
Indecency No. 70: Mary says to Nicodemus: "*Do you think I'm crazy?*" 210
Indecency No. 71: Mary lets out an "inhuman cry." 210
Indecency No. 72: Mary says, "My reason is wavering." 210
Indecency No. 73: Mary asks that the corpse caress her lips so that she can keep her strength to believe that Jesus will rise again. 210
Theological Error No. 103: Redemption did not end with Jesus' last breath because Mary accomplished Redemption by struggling for three days 210
Theological Error No. 204: Eve is described as a woman "guilty of all evil." 214
Indecency No. 75: Mary "no longer controls herself and falls into a new crisis of desolation." 215
Indecency No. 76: Mary cries out again: "a cry that shook even the fibers of the plants." 215

Indecency No. 77: Marie throws herself against the door.....215
Indecency No. 78: Marie attacks the doorframe to it push back 21
Indecency No. 79: Marie scrapes her fingers.....215
Indecency No. 80: Marie breaks her nails.....215
Indecency No. 81: Marie presses her head *against the protrusionrough* ..215
Indecency No. 82: *Her moan sounds like the roar of a lioness* 216
Indecency No. 89: Marie's eyes are "hard and imperious, glassy, phosphorescent."....216
Indecency No. 90: Marie described as bipolar: she goes from a lioness roaring to a gentle dove, a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde 217
Indecency No. 91: Mary "feels disgust and fear for men." 21
Indecency No. 92: Mary says that the stars have always been friends Jesus'and hers, that they kept him company during his agony, that they "know so much." 218
Indecency No. 93: The Virgin Mary talks about little birds.....21
Indecency No. 94: Mary says that tomorrow the doves will come with her to "beat" the stone of the tomb. 218
Indecency No. 95: Mary insults the Temple guards as cowards. 219
Indecency No. 96: Marie says she would have the right to hit the guards at the Temple.....219
Indecency No. 97: Mary Magdalene acknowledges her "cowardice" and her "unbelief" even though she showed heroic courage.....220
Theological Error No. 105: Mary Magdalene already believes in resurrectionJesus' , which contradicts John 20 [13] "And they said to her, 'Woman, why are you weeping?' She said to them, 'Because they have taken away my Lord, and I don't know where they have laid him.'" 220
Indecency No. 98: Twice Mary cries out and then bends down to examine the ground 222
Indecency No. 99: Jesus must not refuse what Mary wants.....222
Poor style No. 6 and 7: As she walks away from the tomb, Mary refers to Jesus as "a lamb of God, a little lamb with curly golden hair." 224
Indecency No. 100: The Virgin Mary asks the young and women beautiful accompanying her to say that Jesus never looked in at her a sensual way.224
Indecency No. 101: "my warm breast" from which "milk flowed".....224
Indecency No. 102: Mary says that Jesus' senses were limited to the need for warmth and food, and that the baby Jesus would rest his little face and sleep on her warm breast. 225
Indecency No. 103: The Virgin Mary speaks of her breasts: "*my breastwarm* " "my breast from which my love flowed as milk" 225
Indecency No. 104: Mary insults Jerusalem: "hyena," "vampire," "vulture."....225
Indecency No. 105: Mary curses the Jews who wanted her deadson 226
Theological Error No. 202 and Indecency No. 106: Mary insults the Jews who wanted her son dead, calling them "cowardly hyenas" and "jackalscreeping ." 226

Indecency No. 107: Mary says, "I am numb with grief."....228
Indecency No. 108: Mary "really drags herself around like a old womandecrepit ." 228
Indecency No. 109: Mary says that her cross may be heavier than her son's. As if Jesus did not also suffer from his mother's suffering. 228
Indecency No. 110: Mary says she would have the right to be cruel to Judas. 229
Indecency No. 111: Mary apologizes to Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus for her insults in the tomb. 229
Indecency No. 112: Joseph of Arimathea says to the Virgin: "Be good." Nicodemus says to her: "Forgive." 230
Indecency No. 113: Mary asks that the door of the Cenacle be opened so that she may breathe in the scent of her child's body, smell "the fragrance of his youthful body." 230
Indecency No. 114: Nicodemus, Joseph, John, or the holy women say to Mary: "You are sick." 230
Indecency No. 114: Mary replies, "Yes, sick." 230
Indecency No. 115: Mary wants to burn her lips by kissing the traces of Jesus' feet and hands left in the Upper Room, on the table, on his seat. She searches for a hair of Jesus. 230
Indecency No. 116: Mary tells Saint John that he is no longer her son because he refuses to open the door of the Cenacle for her, and in the next second, she asks him for forgiveness. 232
Indecency No. 117: Mary asks Jesus for a miracle so that the door of the Cenacle will be opened to her. She clenches her fists and knocks on the door. 232
Indecency No. 118: Marie "comes to her senses" then "cries uncontrollably" 233
Indecency No. 119: Mary insults John, Martha, Mary of Alpheus, and Mary of Cleopas, calling them "useless and lifeless servants," and orders them to leave. They obey "so as not to upset her further." 233
Indecency No. 120: Mary moans and makes noise. 23
Indecency No. 121: Mary tells God in a prayer that she wanted to her son suffer less, so she did not accept what God had allowed and planned from all eternity. 234
Indecency No. 122: Mary says she has become "proud and wicked" and asks God to forgive her "sin of proud hardness." 234
Indecency No. 123: Mary says that Jesus no longer hears her name when she speaks it because he is dead. 234
Indecency No. 124: Mary regrets once again that she was not able to be locked in the tomb. 235
Indecency No. 125: While sleeping, the infant Jesus made a gesture of suckling his mother's breast: this is what Mary thinks about on Good Friday evening. 235
Indecency No. 126: Jesus caressed his mother's breast while suckling. 235

Indecency No. 127: Mary said, "Near your funeral bed, to arrange the swaddling clothes as I did in the past and change them." 235
Indecency No. 128: Mary said, "*I am mad," "I am delirious," "I deliriousam not," "I am not mad."* 236
Note No. 1: Mary breastfed longer than usual because of poverty. 236
Vulgarity No. 1: Mary says about breastfeeding Jesus: "I was your little goat." 236
Indecency No. 129: Mary says to God: "You shouldn't have ...You should not have
..." 237
Indecency No. 130: Marie "is no longer in control of herself" 237
Indecency No. 131 Mary Magdalene mentions her "orgies of love."
.....23
Indecency No. 132: "The Mother could give Him only her tears." 238
Theological Error No. 106: Valtorta changes John 1:35-51: John and Andrew
or John and James? St. James present or in prison?.....23
Theological Error No. 108: During his first encounter with St. Peter, Jesus does not say to him: "You are Simon, son of John, you will be called Cephas, which means Peter." 242
Theological Error No. 203: Does Jesus need Peter for support? A theological dependency? 242
Theological Error No. 109 and Indecency No. 133: St. John lied to highlight Andrew, who was too shy to bring his brother Peter to Jesus. 243
Theological Error No. 110: The sins of the flesh are the main devil's sins. .244
Theological Error No. 111: Jesus claims that the use of the terms "uncle" and "aunt" was intended to put an end to attacks against Mary's perpetual virginity. 244
Theological Error No. 112: Adam suffered the same fate as Lucifer and Judas. 245
Theological Error No. 113: Judas pronounces the name of God as Yahweh, which Jews never did 245
Theological Error No. 114: Jesus asks Judas not to be an apostle 246
Theological Error No. 115: "God is Love become God." 247
Indecency No. 134: Infantilization of Jesus 247
Theological Error No. 116: *Mother, help me (...) I alone cannot [sanctify men]* 249
Indecency No. 135: Jesus curses a Pharisee and his fields, his flocks, his vineyards 250
Theological Error No. 117: "I-We, God One and Triune" 252
Theological Error No. 118: God does not forgive those who become murderers "out of ambition or because they seek the esteem of men." 252
Theological Error No. 119: Jesus invents a curse for mistreating a slave 252
Theological Error No. 120: St. John the Baptist "saw the Spirit descend upon the Word." 253
Theological Error No. 121: Jesus kills Doras while saying that it was God the

Father who killed him 254
Theological Error No. 122: Jesus says, "The Father has entered into me." .254
Theological Error No. 123: "It is not permissible to attack God. He takes vengeance upon Himself." 254
Theological Error No. 124: Contradiction of Jesus: Doras died of anger (604.6) or was killed by God (126.10)? 257
Theological Error No. 125: God waits for the wicked "on the other side to strike them down." 257
Theological Error No. 126: At the particular judgment, the future damned see God and Paradise for an "atomic minute." 258
Theological Error No. 127: The will of the damned would change and become good after their particular judgment 258
Theological Error No. 128: "This parable has such a clear meaning that it doesnot need to be explained." 259
Theological Error No. 129: The lie of the unredacted notebooks 260
The Rich Man is in Hell According to Pope Benedict XVI 283
Theological Error No. 130 and Indecency No. 136: Mary feels in her mind the caresses that people give to Jesus 284
Theological Error No. 131: Jesus does not know the future and corrects himself after the fact. 284
Theological Error No. 132: Jesus says that the doctors will judge "unacceptable and useless" *the Gospel as it was revealed to me* 284
Indecency No. 137: Jesus' lack of tact in revealing the secrets of the Annunciation without warning his mother that he was going to do so, leaving her with a fait accompli. 286
Indecency No. 138: Mary corrects Jesus in public 286
Theological Error No. 133: God forgave original sin by looking at Mary 287
Vulgarity No. 2: God (...) was heavy with you and carried you as his sweet burden. 287
Oddity No. 1: God rejoicing at feeling Mary stirring within Him. 287
Oddity No. 2: God painfully gave birth to Mary to give her to the world. ..287
Theological Error No. 134: Jesus calls Mary "Council of God," even though no creature is the council of God. 287
Theological Error No. 135: The Virgin Mary fainted at the Annunciation. ...288
Theological Error No. 136: The Virgin Mary thanks God publicly for "granting to attain perfect love, perfect herasas a creature can possess." 289
Theological Error No. 137: It is necessary to attain fusionary love in order to "do always God's will with good will." 289
Theological Error No. 138: Mary is "second in the hierarchyecclesiastical ." 290
Theological Error No. 139: Souls pre-exist in mind God'sand are "infused" "later" "when the time is right." 291
Theological Error No. 140: The soul only contracts original sin when it is

infused into the body. 292
Theological Error #141: The soul pre-exists without original sin, then it is stained by original sin. 293
Theological Error No. 142: "God begets only another Himself." 293
Theological Error No. 143: Jesus performs a miracle before a pagan to prove that he has not "lost his power." 293
Theological Error #144: God must be more perfect than man 294
Theological Error #145: Jesus' prayer is not always answered 295
Theological Error No. 146: Insulting insinuation against Mary: her desire was to possess Jesus for herself alone: "So many hours to possess you for myself alone." 295
Theological Error No. 147: Jesus in a solitary prayer says, "Ah! I am delirious!" 296
Theological Error No. 148: "Woman must redeem, as Man redeems." 298
Theological Error No. 149: "Translators always write 'on [this stone].' But I clearly said against [this stone], not on [this stone]." Matthew 21:44 298
Theological Error No. 150: Jesus throws in the towel, he gives up, disgusted by the condemnation of Maria Valtorta's writings. 302
Theological Error No. 151: Jesus, resurrected, weeps 302
Theological Error No. 152: Satan incarnated himself in Judas. 303
Theological Error No. 153: Jesus tells Judas that he is God and his creator 304
Theological Error No. 154: Jesus loved Judas more than Saint John 305
Theological Error No. 155: Judas did not have God in his heart. 305
Theological Error No. 156: Judas is "the damned deicide." 305
Theological Error No. 157: Woe to Judas for being the traitor. 306
Theological Error No. 158: Deleting part of John 13:27 306
Theological Error No. 159: Changing "What you are going to do, do quickly." John 13:27 308
Theological Error #160: Omitting (without the readerinforming) John 13:2 “The devil had already put it into the heart of Judas, Simon’s son, to betray him.” 309
Theological Error No. 161: At the Last Supper, Jesus said, "You have seen the Transubstantiation." 309
Theological Error No. 162: Jesus refers to himself as "the spiritual essence of the second Person." 310
Theological Error No. 163: The entire chapter 17 of the Gospel according to St. John disappears. 310
Theological Error No. 164: The risen Jesus still suffers from Judas. 313
Indecency No. 139: Mary kisses Jesus on the mouth. 314
Indecency No. 140: Instead of talking or hugging each other, there is a cascade of kisses everywhere. 314
Theological Error No. 165: The joy of the risen Jesus is incomplete; he is missing a kiss from his mother on his heart. 314
Theological Error No. 166: Jesus' sad and prosaic words

at the magnificent moment of his first appearance to his Mother after his resurrection. Mary did not understand; he has to explain to her what what happened....314
Theological Error No. 167: Mary "conceived" Jesus 315
Theological Error No. 168: The Persons of the Holy Trinity are parts of God.....315
Theological Error #169: If one honors one Person of the Holy Trinity, one does not honor "the whole" Trinity....315
Theological Error No. 170: Mary merited for Jesus the power to accomplish Redemption.....316
Theological Error No. 171: Contradicting the verses relating to the resurrection of Lazarus....318
Theological Error No. 172: "The Master is there, he is calling you" disappears. 318
Theological Error No. 173: Distorting the Parable of the Ten Virgins.....320
Theological Error No. 174: Judas, the greatest of all sinners. 320 Theological Error No. 175: "To forgive Judas would be a sacrilege against my divinity, which he betrayed, and it would be an injustice to all other men." 320
Theological Error No. 176: We see the essence of God at the judgmentparticular ; God is "glimpsed during the particular judgment."...322
Theological Error No. 177: *One of the torments of hell is to find oneself forever in darkness "after having seen the light of paradise." "after seeing the Light that is God"*....322
Theological Error No. 178: Jesus lacks self-control; he begins to raise his arm to strike Judas, he begins to curse, then refrains from striking and cursing Judas.....322
Theological Error No. 179: Jesus insults the gold coins: " filthSatan's! Cursed gold! Spit of hell! Serpent's venom!"....323
Theological Error No. 180: Judas tried everything to get himself expelled from the group of the twelve apostles. 325
Theological Error No. 181: Judas is damned because he did not say to Jesus, "Lord, save me!"....325
Theological Error No. 182: Judas' greatest mistake was believing that Jesus was God.....326
Theological Error No. 183: Judas was afraid of falling directly into hell like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram and their followers. 326
Theological Error No. 184: Jesus lies to a child about Judas.....329
Theological Error No. 185: Eve lived to satisfy her lust and .debauchery....331
Note: In 1944, 90% of humans lived to satisfy their lust. 331
Theological Error No. 186: Contraception is prostitution 332
Theological Error #187: Jesus does not help Catholics understand and accept the condemnation of contraception.....332
Theological Error No. 188: Jesus speaks ambiguously about pleasure without giving his criteria for morality.....332
The indecency of an apparition or vision proves that it does not come from God.....334

Theological Error No. 189 and Indecency No. 141: Jesus kisses St. James on the mouth 334
Theological Error No. 190 and Indecency No. 142: Jesus kisses Judas on the mouth 336
Theological Error No. 191 and Indecency No. 143: Jesus kisses Abel on the mouth 337
Theological Error No. 192 and Indecency No. 144: St. Peter silences Jesus by kissing him on the mouth 338
Theological No. 193 and Indecency No. 145: Jesus kisses a Errorbaby on the mouth 339
Theological Error No. 194 and Indecency No. 146: Jesus kisses a second baby on the mouth 341
Theological Error No. 195 and Indecency No. 147: Jesus kisses a child under the age of 15 on the mouth to perform a miracle 342
Note: Does "The Gospel as Revealed to Me" encourage us to see kisses on the mouth throughout the Bible? 342
Theological Error No. 196: Satan retains a remnant of love for Jesus, whom he contemplated in Heaven. 344
Theological Error No. 197: Satan tells Jesus that he knows he is God but ,a minute earlier he tells him that God is far away from him. Another error: Satan says that he knows men better than God, their creatoromniscient . 345
Theological Error No. 198: Evangelists have hidden first Satan's temptation of Jesus in the desert: to incite him to marry.....345
Theological Error No. 199: Inviting Jesus, exhausted from 40 days without drinkfood or , to get married, then realizing within a minute that it was foolish. 345
Scientific Error #3: The imprint on the Shroud was fixed by uremic toxins .346
Scientific Error #4: St. Joseph refers to the Haggadah, which did not exist at the time of Jesus.....347
Scientific Error #5: Ridiculing Jesus by making him use psychoanalytic language: Jesus speaks of the forces of the "ego." 347
Scientific Error #6: Women are better than menat shopping 348
Scientific Error #7: Jesus says that the brain is the seat of intelligence, whereas at the time everyone thought that the heart was the seat of intelligence 348
Scientific Error No. 8: The nail in the left arm was not driven into the palm as Valtorta says, but into the wrist, as in the

right hand. 348
Scientific Error No. 9: The suffering is greater in the wrist than in the palm, contrary to what Valtorta says, because the nerve is severed by the nail in the wrist and not by a nail in the palm.
.....348
Scientific Error No. 10: Repeating the mistake of placing the nail and the wound of the left hand in the metacarpal bone rather than in the wrists (VS Saint Suaire and the book by Dr. Pierre Barbet).....349
Scientific Error No. 11: Valtorta's visions of Jesus' agony on the cross and the

details of his physical suffering are contradicted by science.....349
Scientific Error No. 12: The Temple of Jerusalem has domes covered with gold.....350
Scientific Error No. 13: Mary and Joseph's house is locked with a key, a luxury item at the time. 357
Scientific Error #14: A man from Nazareth when speaking to Jesus.uses the word "cousins" 357
Scientific Error #15: Continual caressing in public is an error regarding Jewish customs at the time. 35
Scientific Error No. 16: Jesus kisses mother on the cheeks.Judas' 358
Scientific Error #17: Only the *patibulum*, the horizontal bar of the cross, was carried by those condemned to crucifixion; Valtorta sees Jesus carrying a cross like those found in churches.....359
Scientific error No. 18: "a real cross (...) reinforced by (...) bolts."....359
Scientific Error No. 19: *The cross slips from his hands and falls.* 360
Scientific Error No. 20: Valtorta sees crosses that had to each timebe replanted and fixed in holes dug in the ground 36
Scientific Error No. 21: The Romans offer cloths to the crucified to hide their nakedness. 361
Scientific Error No. 22: The executioners sit on Jesus to nail his hands. 361
Scientific Error #23: *The cross is dragged near the hole.* 362
Scientific Error #24: "The final convulsions" 362
Scientific Error #25: *The kidneys and the entire spine curve outward.* 363
Scientific Error #26: The body's weight falls back onto the feet 363
Scientific Error #27: The way the crucified men are taken down from the cross 364
Scientific Error No. 28: *The arm falls down alongside the body* 364
Scientific Error No. 29: *The horrible tear in the left hand* 364
Scientific Error No. 30: They bury Jesus' body under a thick layer of ointment 365
Scientific Error #31: Hands always slipped because of their

dead limb weight.....365
Scientific Error #32: The shroud is a "large piece of cloth."....365
Scientific Error #33: Jesus has very dark blue eyes.....366
Scientific Error No. 34: St. Peter refers to "chapter 52" of Isaiah, even though chapters did not exist at the time.....367
Scientific Error No. 35: The Jews of Palestine pronounce the sacred name of God as "Jehovah." 367
Scientific Error No. 36 Jesus quibbles over a false subtlety of translation: it should be translated "drink from my cup, drink from my chalice" and not "drink my cup, drink my chalice" because only Jesus could drink the chalice to the dregs.....368
Scientific Error No. 37: Jesus says that have been found prehistoric skeletonswhose "power" amazes scientists because of their size. However, all the skeletons found measure between 1.06 and 1.70 meters 368
Scientific Error No. 38: Jesus is blond. 369

Scientific Error No. 39: St. Peter wants to eat crab, an impure food forbidden by God 370
Theological Error No. 200: Evangelists are accused of having omitted episodes from the life of Jesus that they did not approve of because of "their unbreakable Hebrew mentality." 371
Anti-Semitism No. 6: "How many things (...) the evangelists left out because of their indestructible Jewish mentality about episodes they did not approve of!" 371
Anti-Semitism No. 7: The anti-Semitism of Maria Valtorta denounced by Sandra Miesel, *an American Jewish writer*....372
1. The context....373
2. Controversy, popularity, and fundamental flaw 376
3. An imaginary world strewn with flowers and a furious Jesus 379
4. Valtorta's deplorable anti-Semitism....383
Theological Error No. 201: Women will be priests of a orderlower 386
Indecency No. 149: The Holy Spirit said, *"Be silent,"* to Mary 388
Indecency No. 150: The Holy Spirit does not cover Mary with his shadow, he "enters" into her....388
Note No. 3: The expression "seed of God" is not appropriate 388
Vulgarity No. 3: Saint Joseph, "an honest man," whom Mary turned into an angel 389
Note: St. John the Baptist was sanctified in his mother's womb. 389
Vulgarity No. 4: Mary speaks of "females" 389
Vulgarity No. 5: Jesus describes John as "a lamb that has never been shorn." 390
Vulgarity No. 6: Jesus' love will take the place of a woman in St. John.....390
Vulgarity No. 7: Mary says of Jesus: "my creature."....390
Vulgarity No. 8: Mary caresses a young shepherd. 390
Vulgarity No. 9: "a golden sparkle at the tip of each hair" 390
Obscenity No. 10: Jesus evokes Anne's caresses on Joachim during their wedding night....391
Vulgarity No. 11: Zachariah, "the poor old man"....391
Vulgarity No. 12: Jesus says that his mother "did not even know the instinctive urge of the flesh." 392
Vulgarity No. 13: Jesus talks about "lukewarm breasts" and twins who smell "the taste of their brother's saliva."....392
Vulgarity No. 14: Jesus says that his mother was "without blemish."....392
Oddity No. 3: Jesus talks about races: "Hebrew race, Eastern race" 392
Indecency No. 148: exposing a very young girl to a crowd. 393
Vulgarity No. 15: The Virgin Mary did not give off any bad smells just before ascending to Heaven. 393
Vulgarity No. 16: "The female I had re-consecrated" "You are reduced to being females no better than animal companions."....393

Oddity No. 4: Marie empties herself of all feminism 394
Vulgarity No. 17: God takes his "revenge" on Satan.....394
Rebuke No. 1: *5.10 Leave aside your publications filled with things obscure, foul, filthy, venomous, deceitful, blasphemous, corrupting*.....396
Reprimand No. 2: *5.10 (...) good (....) that you always be, each one in , are prevaricators, proud, lustful, murderers,*.....396
Reprimand No. 3: 90% of you live to satisfy your lust, for debauchery 396
Note No. 4: Maria Valtorta lives in fear of herself and deceivingothers 396
Oddity No. 5: Mary is anxious even though Joseph has fully accepted and shared her vow of perpetual virginity, and the miracle of the flowering branch proves divine approval of this plan.....397
Oddity No. 6: Jesus, St. John, and Mary are blond with blue eyes. 398
Oddity No. 7: Mary appears (...) blonde like an angel.....39
Indecency No. 151: Jesus proposes a book burning 398
Remark No. 5: Jesus tells a peasant that his mother is showering nowhim with her gifts of love. 398
Note No. 6: Eager and tender interaction between Jesus and John. 399
Note 7: Mary does not know that Judas has hanged himself and is already in hell.....400
Vulgarity No. 18: "Heavy burden" of humanity by St. Joseph. 401
Note No. 8: Mary caresses a lot in Maria Valtorta.....401
Remark No. 9: The lie of the notebooks without deletions.....401
Note No. 3: More than 66% will go to hell; Jesus died in vain for them.....402

Mediocre style: many things are "small".....403
Scientific error No. 40: At Easter, the Jews cut the roast lamb into slices with a knife 404
15 errors in The Wedding at Cana.....40
Theological error No. 202: Valtorta removes five and a half verses from twelve the verses that make up the Wedding at Cana.....405
Scientific error No. 41: Women add cutlery to the table, even though Jews did not use it 406
Scientific error No. 42: Some women are sitting at the table with the men 406
Theological error No. 203 and scientific error No. 43: The Church forgot to translate "from now on" in verse 4.....407
Theological error No. 204: Does Mary want Jesus "all to herself"? Is Mary a possessive, self-centered mother? 408
Theological Error No. 205: "My hour has not yet come" is deleted. 409
Theological Error No. 206: Three copper jars instead of six jarsstone 41
Theological Error No. 207: It is not Jesus who tells the servants to serve the master of the banquet, it is the steward who serves himself.....412
Theological Error No. 207-208: Verses 9 and 10 deleted 41
Theological Error No. 209: Jesus and his Mother are glorified in place of the bridegroom. 413
Theological Error No. 210: Valtorta omits John 2:11 This was at Cana in the first of the miracles that Jesus performed Galilee, and he manifested his

glory, and his disciples believed in him. 414
Theological Error No. 211: Valtorta contradicts John 2:12 415
Theological Error No. 212: Mary's lips tremble when she cannot kiss Jesus 415
Vulgarity No. 19-20: Mary and Jesus "order" the servants....416
Theological No. 213: leaving readers ignorant Errorof important facts....416
Conclusion on the Wedding at Cana according to Maria Valtorta 419
Indecency No. 152: God gives a vision of a young woman Maria Valtorta completely naked. 420
Indecency No. 153: God a vision of a young man gives Maria Valtorta completely naked....421
Conclusion 423
Mediumistic feat and theological shipwreck? 42
Deceived by her gift of clairvoyance and/or by the devil? 424
Valtorta ended her life in complete mental isolation. 424
In 1950, she sensed her total and definitive condemnation 424
Jesus, who preached to all from the beginning that he was Christ and God425
The fable of the evil Holy Office and the kind Pius XII 425

The Valtortists discover that the file is available for consultation 426
Compare Valtorta and St. Thomas for each verse....427
The Virgin Mary quasi-deified and dragged lower than the earth 42
Know, love, and serve God 42
Appendices....429
Letter from Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger dated January 31, 1985....429
Response of the Valtortists to Ratzinger's condemnation 430
1961, Articles from *La Civilta Cattolica*....431
Letter from Cardinal Ratzinger's secretary dated September 9, 1988 432